

# AMERICA

## A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XXIV. No. 19 }  
WHOLE No. 596 }

February 26, 1921

{ \$4.00 A YEAR  
{ PRICE, 10 CENTS

### CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHRONICLE .....	441-444
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Catholic Minus the Pope—The Growth of the Bishops' Press Bureau—Peace Temple or Tower of Babel?—The Holy Office and the Y. M. C. A.—Senator King on the Smith Bill.	445-453
COMMUNICATIONS .....	454-455
EDITORIALS	
Race and Religious Prejudices—What is an "Open Shop"?—Monkey Marriages—The British Premier and Ireland—"Slice of Life" Novels .....	456-458
LITERATURE	
Five Novels by Americans— <i>In Petto</i> —Reviews—Books and Authors .....	458-461
EDUCATION	
Governor Miller Speaks His Mind.....	461-462
SOCIOLOGY	
An Economic Development in France.....	462-464
NOTE AND COMMENT .....	464

## Chronicle

**Peace Conference.**—The confusion attaching to the reparations question has increased rather than lessened during the past week. At the direction of the German

**Reparations** Foreign Office, experts in business, finance, commerce, banking, transportation, industries, mines, and so on, have been holding meetings at Berlin, with a view to drafting the proposals of which so much has been said. No hint has been given as to the sum which Germany will set as the utmost limit of her capacity to pay; but it is announced that unanimity has been reached on two vital points, namely, that the twelve per cent tax on exports must be rejected and that the amount fixed by the Allies on January 29 is impossibly high.

France, on the other hand, is determined that the figure recently agreed on shall not be reduced. Premier Briand has declared that the present French Government represents the last effort in favor of peace, and that France has reached the extreme limit of concessions with the purpose of aiding the economic restoration of Germany. Believing that Germany will be restrained from evading responsibility for the damages of the war, only by a threat of

force, the French are elaborating plans for military action. It is said that the French contemplate moving their armies and occupying further German territory, should the Germans refuse to accept the reduced demands of the Allies, and that they will exact the much higher sum set by the Reparations Commission, under the terms of the Versailles Treaty. This step they would prefer to take in conjunction with the Allies, but it has been stated that they are prepared to take military action alone, if the other Allied nations hesitate to give aid.

England's position on reparations was outlined by the British Premier in the House of Commons on February 8, when he defended the Government from criticism which charged him and his colleagues with shirking the task of forcing Germany to live up to the terms of the Treaty. He pointed out that much had already been done in the way of executing the Treaty. He called attention to the fact that both the German fleet and the German army had disappeared, that huge amounts of war material had been surrendered and the German colonies had been given up. With regard to the reparations, he declared that he stood by his pledge to exact payment from Germany to the full limit of that country's capacity, but the crucial difficulty consisted in determining what that capacity actually is. The sum set at the recent Paris Conference, he continued, was determined upon after taking the best available advice. He would go to the London Conference prepared to do his best "to get from Germany the last farthing she is capable of paying," but he refused to go there "in the spirit of advancing proposals which, upon the advice of the best experts, we know to be utterly impracticable and would only raise false hopes in this country." How far England would consent to the military action against Germany is not clear, but Mr. Lloyd George declared in the House of Commons on February 18 that before coercive measures could be taken, the Government's Parliament and the people must be convinced that the German policy was deliberately defiant.

Dr. Simons, the German Foreign Minister, has openly declared that in his opinion the first attempts of the conference will not lead to an understanding, and that it will be extremely difficult to agree on new reparations methods. In one of his recent speeches, he said, "France will not succeed in obtaining from Germany the draft on the future for which she hopes. It will be our task in London to make this clearer." That he is not unaware of the possible consequences of Germany's refusal to accept the Paris decisions is evident from his statement, that in

such a case, measures looking to the breaking up of the empire will come into force. With a view to discouraging such action on the part of the Allies, he said: "But any attack from the outside on the constitution of the empire, I gather from my tour of South Germany, would meet with the unanimous resistance of the whole people." He was going to the London Conference, he added, convinced that the idea of the inviolability of the empire could not be torn from the hearts of the German people as a whole. With France and Germany apparently irreconcilable, and England, though thoroughly on the side of France, far from committed to the use of force, the prospects of the conference are by no means bright.

**China.**—Besides the present affliction of a great famine and the recently subdued military factions, China is now disturbed by a movement in the southern provinces led

*Sun Yat Sen's  
Movement*

by Dr. Sun Yat Sen. According to the *Manchester Guardian*:

He and his party known as the Constitutional party, demand above all things the convening in Peking of a freely-elected Parliament that shall be permitted to lay down the laws of the land without interference by the military. That program has secured to Dr. Sun Yat Sen the impassioned support of all the more progressive spirits in China. His followers were recently successful in expelling from Canton a self-imposed Military Government. Though this Government declined to recognize the decrees of Peking, a special allowance was made to it from the customs revenues, which are under the control of the Great Powers. But, for reasons that are difficult to grasp, the Powers now refuse to grant to the rebellious Constitutional Government of Dr. Sun Yat Sen the boon they had bestowed upon the rebellious Military Government, now overthrown. To this decision Dr. Sun Yat Sen has replied by intimating that he will himself collect the customs in the provinces under his control, retain what he thinks his due, and then hand over the balance to Peking.

A fuller concept of the gravity and extent of the plague may be gained from the description Mr. I. F. Marcossou has lately written for the McClure Newspaper Syndicate.

*The Famine*

He says that five very populous provinces in the northeast corner of the Chinese Republic normally support 85,000,000 people, of whom some ninety per cent are farmers, simple and frugal folk who usually harvest two crops a year. Before the fall harvest of 1916 was ready, a flood ravaged the countryside, causing a loss of \$100,000,000. The crops of 1917 and 1918 were also bad, and this winter finds 45,000,000 people directly affected and one-third of that number actually starving, ten persons, it is estimated, dying every minute.

**Egypt.**—On February 18, Lord Milner, former Colonial Secretary, presented a report to Parliament strongly advising that Egypt be given self-government without delay, necessary reservations being made, however, to uphold British interests and to protect the rights of foreigners. He says that it would be unwise to put off

longer the fulfilment of England's promise to give Egypt self-government, for the spirit of the people cannot be extinguished and British control is now very difficult and dangerous. Lord Milner continued:

It is essential to insure that independent Egypt does not pursue a foreign policy hostile or prejudicial to the interests of the British Empire. It is also imperative to insure the safety and protect the rights of foreign residents.

We hold that in fact, as well as in theory, Egypt should be governed by Egyptians. We have sufficient faith in the reform work of the last forty years to believe such a course now can be followed with good prospects of success, but it must be adopted whole-heartedly and in a spirit of hopefulness and sympathy.

We do not attempt to conceal our conviction that Egypt is not yet in a position to dispense with British assistance in her internal administration. We are greatly fortified in the belief that the Egyptians will acquiesce in this view by our own experience in dealing with representatives of the Egyptians, with whom we have come in such intimate contact. We are not discouraged by the fact that they are not all as yet prepared to commit themselves unreservedly to every point in a settlement they collaborated with us in devising.

The Egyptians strongly object, the report states, to the word "protectorate," and refuse to have in the country what could be regarded as a British garrison or an army of occupation. They insist that the question of internal order is one for the Egyptians themselves to settle. Lord Milner's report concedes Egypt's right to appoint her own foreign representatives, with full diplomatic status.

**England.**—Premier Lloyd George declared in the House of Commons on February 15 in the debate on the King's speech reopening Parliament that any German proposals in connection with the reparations demands of the Entente Allies would be "carefully considered

*Parliament Reopens;  
Premier's Speech*

with a real desire to take the most effective measures for Germany to liquidate her liabilities under the Treaty of Versailles." He denied that the reparations decisions arrived at by the Allies in the Paris conference held in January revised the Versailles settlement. At the same time he refused a debate on the subject, in advance of the forthcoming conference of the Allied Prime Ministers in London, and declared that he knew nothing of any counter proposals to be brought forward by Germany. Aside from this reference, which many of his hearers interpreted as manifesting a willingness to allow Germany a greater latitude in the matter of reparations than the Premier had seemed to allow in his previous Birmingham speech, Mr. Lloyd George refused to discuss international or other important questions, mainly confining himself to the Irish question. According to Lloyd George, the peace negotiations carried on last December through the intermediary of Mgr. Patrick Clune, Archbishop of Perth, Australia, with certain Irish representatives, failed because the Irish Republicans refused to give up their arms as a condition of the truce.

The King's speech dealt with unemployment, the safeguarding of key industries, coal, liquor control, the return



of the railways to private ownership, reform of the House of Lords, and Ireland, declaring against a republic. When in the Commons the debate on the King's speech began, the ranks of the Opposition were increased by the accession of the two Cecils, Lord Hugh and Lord Robert, while others of the Opposition heckled the Government more sharply than it has been heckled in many months. Former Prime Minister Herbert H. Asquith, now Liberal leader of the Opposition party in the House, attacked the King's speech, calling it especially remarkable for what it had left unsaid. Mr. Asquith asked definite information on three important points, Germany, Mesopotamia and Ireland. Mr. Thomas, speaking for the Labor party, confined himself to Ireland. He openly made the charge that in the killings at Mallow Station the police had ordered the men to run and then shot and killed them.

On February 18, the House of Commons rejected by a vote of 263 to 184, a majority of only 78, the amendment to the Address from the Throne, introduced by John Robert Clynes, Laborite, regretting the Government's failure to deal with the unemployment problem. On its face, the vote was a victory for the Cabinet, but it shows nevertheless a break in the majority which till then the Prime Minister had enjoyed. In a membership of 707 the Unionists have a normal total vote of more than 500, including the Irish members from Ulster, who support the Cabinet. The Opposition has been able to count less than 135 votes at best, because the Sinn Fein members elected to Parliament refused to take their seats.

On the same date, the Prime Minister earnestly appealed to the banks to take a fair share in the risks of granting credits to the impoverished European countries and in this way help the development of trade. Trade, he said, was equally bad in all countries, hence one must suppose that Governments were equally bad in all countries, and that trade would never be restored until all countries were ruled by an anti-waste league. International trade, he continued, must again be revived, otherwise, no matter what legislation and administration might accomplish, there would ultimately result starvation and ruin. Questioned as to whether the Government would approach the Washington and Tokio Governments with regard to arranging a limitation of armaments, the Premier replied that the question was engaging the Government's attention, but that it would be premature to make any statement.

**France.**—The discussion in the Chamber with regard to the Government's agricultural budget furnished M. de Gailhard-Bancel, one of the keenest and most active of the Catholic deputies, with the opportunity, which he did not fail to improve, of paying a merited tribute to the services rendered to agriculture by private initiative in almost every part of France. M. Jean Guiraud tells us in *La Croix* how M. de Gailhard-Bancel, during the debate which took place on the Government's program,

eloquently recalled the benefits conferred on the cause of agriculture by "*les écoles libres*," the schools operated by private initiative, and which are almost all Catholic.

He informed the Chamber that it was due to the efforts of all those who fostered the free system of higher education that France owed most of those technical institutes which the Government is now anxious to affiliate with its scientific schools. He specifically mentioned, for the West the agricultural school annexed to the Catholic University of Angers; for the South, the school recently founded under the inspiration, if not the direct initiative, of the Catholic Institute of Toulouse. A colleague of M. de Gailhard-Bancel, M. Guérin, Deputy of La Manche, added to the details already given, that the Brothers of Ploërmel, the Lamennais Brothers as they are sometimes called, since they were founded by the brother of the unfortunate Félicité de Lamennais, have done for agriculture in France work equal in value to that done by the disciples of St. Jean Baptiste de la Salle in other fields of education. M. Guiraud himself adds in his article in *La Croix*, his own personal testimony to those already given, mentioning the magnificent work done by the Marianists in the school directed by them at Saint-Remy in the Haute Saône, a school unfortunately closed during the persecution directed some time ago against the Religious Orders. From this famous school, went forth according to M. Guiraud, the best farmers of the Doubs, all trained to the most modern methods and more especially to the scientific handling of modern farm machinery. Catholic laymen, adds the editor of *La Croix*, were everywhere in the forefront of this important movement. As they were prominent in the formation of "social weeks," so they took a large part in what might be termed "agricultural or farm weeks" during which experts gave the vine-dressers, fruit and wheat growers practical lectures on the best methods of work, while lessons in domestic science were also given to the women in centers chosen for the purpose. All this was done without aid, or with very little aid, from the Government, by private initiative and with private funds. The Minister of Agriculture, M. Lefebvre du Prey, at the close of the debate added his testimony to the splendid work done by private initiative in an industry which today is one of the most important in France.

**Ireland.**—The President of Ireland, Eamon de Valera, drew attention to the second anniversary of the foundation of Dail Eireann by issuing the following manifesto:

*De Valera's  
Manifesto*

Fellow-citizens: I am glad to be with you to greet and congratulate you on the second anniversary of the formal confirmation of our nation's undying desire for its ancient independence. The founding of our State on the ascertained will of the people, the giving practical effect in our own regard to those rational principles universally accepted during the war as the only basis for a lasting peace between the nations, the faithfulness with

*Catholic Agricultural  
Schools*

which through two terrible years you have stood firm in the face of a ruthless repression, will make our nation shine out as long as human records endure, a glorious exception in this sad period of abandonment of ideals, and conscienceless betrayals.

Great indeed have been your sufferings. For months authentic dispatches brought news of the almost daily assassination of representative citizens, of the callous murder and mutilation of defenseless prisoners, of the floggings and inhuman torturings of brave men—even the boy condemned to the scaffold who would not be false to his patriot comrades—of the massacre and the wanton shootings of unarmed citizens, women, and children, in the public places, of the burnings of homes and the looting and destruction of the fruits of your industry, and I know how heavy the price you were being made to pay for your devotion. But, thank God, though the armed bully is in your streets and with cowardly insolence he taunts you with your powerlessness, the ancient heroism of your fathers which enabled them to face undaunted the persecutors of their day is yours also, and your sufferings serve but to teach you how dearly bought and how precious is the heritage which they have passed on to you to guard.

Thank God that splendid morale which has made you the wonder of the nations remains unbroken, and the enemy is once more learning that though with brute force brave men and brave women may be murdered brute force can never reach the spirit that inspires them.

Your sufferings will surely not be in vain. The surrender of right which alone could give victory to the usurper with all his forces and his frightfulness he can never compel. Love of country and of freedom will in your case, as in others, prove superior to the might of his Empire, and every drop of patriot blood that he sheds will but make for us more sacred the duty of perseverance and more certain its fulfilment. No one can be base enough now to barter away that for which our noblest have given up their lives, and so, though the moment is dark and the world unheeding, confident of final success, with calm deliberation, let us face the new year of the Republic, ready to endure whatever yet may be necessary to win for those who come after us that priceless boon of permanent peace and secure liberty in their native land.

Dublin, January 21, 1921.

EAMON DE VALERA.

Later, President de Valera sent a letter to all members of the British Parliament, lest they "under plea of ignorance should disclaim responsibility for what is being done here" [in Ireland]. The document reads in part as follows:

The troops were guilty of torturing prisoners, assassinating men and boys in the streets and prisons, murdering women, children and clergymen, and outraging Irish women and girls, flogging and the maltreatment of groups of civilians; issuing and enforcing crawling and such-like humiliating and degrading orders; taking men from their work and forcing them to do military duty or work at military labor as slave gangs; burning and looting factories, creameries, shops and dwelling houses; the destruction of farmsteads and farm produce and the killing and maiming of live stock.

Although you have put your troops on active service in Ireland, although you have sought to justify many vile deeds committed as acts of war, and although you are armed with the deadliest modern machinery of war and protected by every means known to technical skill, you now seek to purchase immunity from defensive action by our party by taking possession of all firearms, possession of which is an offense for which an Irishman may be arrested and shot and for which one has been shot, and by carrying Irish citizens in your military expeditions against our people.

The orders to your troops are to shoot these hostages, should the unit with which they are traveling be attacked. Already under the specious pretense that they were trying to escape, many Irish prisoners have been brutally murdered by your troops. Now representative Irish citizens are to be murdered similarly on the ground, pretended or true, that the party with which they are moving is attacked.

These things are done because it is your will that they should be done. If you willed otherwise they would cease. It is you, not your troops, who are primarily responsible.

King George, in his speech opening Parliament and Lloyd George in his address to the House of Commons, referred to Ireland in the same way, to the effect, namely,

that Britain would yield nothing to violence. The latter had much to say also of alleged better conditions in

Erin, but, unfortunately, for the unhappy land, his statements are at variance with facts as related by all the Irish papers, many English papers, such as the *London Nation* and the weekly *Manchester Guardian*, and most unprejudiced American papers. As was expected the Premier refused to publish the Strickland report of the Cork tragedy, much to the satisfaction of Greenwood, who repeated the refusal in his own name the following day. However, Lloyd George admitted "indiscipline on the part of auxiliary forces" and with a magnificent gesture announced that severe measures had been enforced against the company involved. The measures consisted in the dismissal from service of seven suspects. Evidently the tragic humor of his statement is not appreciated by the Premier. English papers, as far apart in thought and policy as the *Manchester Guardian* and the *London Morning Post* condemn the suppression of the report, and dispatches from Ireland declare that Lloyd George dare not publish it for fear the Black and Tans will revolt. Meantime the Premier is being pushed very hard on one side by the junkers who demand even more severe measures against Ireland and on the other side by the Laborites who insist on a peaceful settlement of the difficulty.

The rumble of dissatisfaction over Britain's misgovernment of Ireland is heard also in the Dominions. For instance, press dispatches report this expression of news by Archbishop Clune of Perth, Australia:

I say with regret and reluctance, that every infamy perpetrated by Germany during her occupation of Belgium has been renewed and repeated, and in some cases exceeded, in Ireland. I subscribe to every word used by Eamon de Valera in his recent charges against English forces in Ireland. A blacklist of persons who are to be assassinated is placed in the hands of those in the pay of the Crown, which is responsible for the situation. The appalling horrors of this hellish policy have not achieved their object, but have embittered moderate Irishmen.

Canadian Liberals are equally outspoken in their condemnation of British atrocities in Ireland. In the United States feeling is about the same. Just at present there is extensive and well managed boycott against English goods, that is causing grave concern, both in New York and New England, but especially in the latter place.



## Catholic Minus the Pope

FLOYD KEELER

NOT long after my submission to the authority of the Catholic Church, and before I had fairly adjusted myself to the very much changed circumstances in which I found myself, a priest said to me that Anglicans were the most Protestant of Protestants, and that High-Church Anglicans were the most Protestant of all. I rather resented this statement and laid it to the fact that he, a "born" Catholic of Irish extraction, could not appreciate the position which one like myself had occupied. However the remark stuck in my memory and after the lapse of years and with the study of Anglicanism from the outside and of the Catholic Church from within, I have been able to see wherein it was not only justified, but that it actually describes their condition more accurately and epigrammatically than any other form of expression could do.

I know that if these words are read by any "Catholic" Anglicans or by any Catholics who have come into casual and superficial contact with Anglicans or Anglicanism of the "Catholic" type, they will likely produce the reaction they did in me when I first heard them. How can a set of men who hold practically every Catholic doctrine in its entirety, who frequently lead lives of heroic Catholic practice, whose whole soul is fired with love of the things which distinguish the Catholic, be called Protestant? Do they not hate and despise modern Protestantism and its perversion of the Faith? Do they not consider the Reformation as the great crime of Christian history and utterly repudiate it and all its works? Are they not striving in their own communion to expunge, as a foreign substance, every trace of that Calvinism which fastened itself upon their own fair *Ecclesia Anglicana* in that transitory period when Henry's lust and Elizabeth's pride had given room to continental "Reformers" to usurp the places of their own leaders in parish and university? Protestant forsooth! Go into their churches today, and see the altar complete with tabernacle and sanctuary lamp, as the center of all their worship. People are reverently doing obeisance before the "reserved Sacrament" and the "Mass" is carried on with a dignity and reverence too often, alas, lacking in our own churches. Vestments and accessories of every sort are there in the very best of taste and in the most correct shapes and shades. Stations of the Cross adorn the walls, confessionals invite the penitent to enter, and holy water fonts stand at the doors. Question one of these "priests" walking about in cassock and biretta, maybe saying his Office, or even telling his beads. Ask him what he believes and teaches. Is it Protestant doctrine? Transubstantiation, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the seven Sacraments, an absolutely correct Christology, a firm profession of belief in the

authority of the Catholic Church, all these one hears from his lips. How dare we say that he is a Protestant? And if we say it to him he will resent it with indignation. I know, dear reader, for I was one of those who held to just such a position. I was a "Catholic priest" if anyone wanted to know, and was very particular to have it known too. But what differentiated me and those who held to similar tenets, from those in the Protestant Episcopal Church who frankly avowed themselves Protestants, and who more consistently with our published formularies believed that "Transubstantiation . . . is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given rise to many superstitions," and who did not find it necessary to juggle their catechism in order to teach the existence of more than two Sacraments? I know the "Catholics" will deny that these things are so, but place the Book of Common Prayer in the hands of one not prejudiced in favor of one or the other view and see what his verdict is as to the teaching of extracts such as the one I have quoted above. We had Catholic authority for our beliefs and practices, but we did not realize how inconsistent we were in accepting and teaching on the Church's authority, fasting communion for example, and yet denying that authority when the Church spoke on the subject of lawful jurisdiction. We stood firmly for the Catholic discipline on matrimony so far as its indissolubility was concerned, and regarded it as a Sacrament, though the Thirty-nine Articles were very shaky on the subject, but when it came to the Catholic discipline on the subject so far as the clergy are concerned, we exercised our own individual judgment backed up by no better authority than those same Thirty-nine Articles. And what is this but Protestantism? This picking and choosing of doctrines and practices is not Catholic, no matter how Catholic may be the doctrines and practices which are chosen for one's use. It is quite true that when one's mind prefers those things which the Catholic Church holds, when it is attracted to its tenets, feels that they represent the truth, and the interior witness of his conscience corroborates the exterior witness of the Church's pronouncement, he is on the road to becoming a real Catholic. But he is not a Catholic until he has made an unconditional submission to what the Church says. "I believe because Thy Church hath spoken in Thy Name," must be the convert's act of faith, and until he is ready to make that he is not and cannot be a Catholic. This helps to account for the position of many Anglicans who, holding everything that the Catholic Church teaches, even to the doctrine of Papal infallibility in some instances, still remain outside the fold. And it is this eclecticism in

doctrine that keeps them where they are, and that makes them essentially Protestant.

One who has not been in the Protestant Episcopal Church can hardly realize how insidiously this is taught in the midst of the "Catholic" teachings of advanced Anglicanism. The following extract, written by one of their number, serves to show what we mean:

As Catholics we belong to a club called the Church. The club is some 2,000 years old. In this club alone we can get our meals; in this club alone we can meet our friends; in this club alone we can sleep or argue or organize or pray. This club holds endless debates about everything—seas, stars, boots, biology, sacraments, suffrage, self-determination, alps, and bishops. Among other things, our club has always discussed the question of authority. The question is all the more interesting because in different ages different answers have been given. But these discussions are meant to amuse the club. No one ever dreamt of their being allowed to destroy it. Yet they certainly would destroy the Catholic Club if once they meant that we were rude to the members or stingy to the waiters.

This is a strong instance of the big thing against the small: that the Catholic Church, in Heaven and earth, east and west, is the huge house in which we live, while modern Roman Catholicism is a comparatively small but interesting member of the club, which has quite recently asked to be domesticated in it and now claims to be the whole club.

This is flirting with heresy. Such writing has for its object to blind the devotees of this school to the fact that no diversity of opinion has been permitted in the Church on the matter of authority. Whenever that authority has been questioned, those who did so were menaced with the anathema of the Church. If they persisted they were expelled from the Church and adjudged heretics or schismatics.

It is true that Anglicanism is a sort of debating society, but that merely goes to show that it possesses no authority to settle any matters which may come before it. Some of its members are adepts in debate, they could vanquish in argument some of us simple-minded people who believe in the Church's infallible teachings, but that proves nothing so far as facts are concerned. An individual fact cannot be changed, but a series of facts can be put into juxtaposition so as to prove anything one pleases, and the inferences which are drawn from the juggling of facts may be thoroughly-unsound.

Being a Catholic does not consist in the use of Catholic practices or in holding Catholic doctrines, else that curious body of Congregationalists and other Non-Conformists in England who call themselves "The Society of Free Catholics" would be Catholics indeed. They have a "Mass" which is very satisfactory from the viewpoint of Catholic liturgy, more so than the present Anglican service in many respects. They teach many things quite at variance with ordinary Protestant doctrine, and their aim is to "Catholicize the free Churches." This they may do so to some extent, for the absorption of Catholic doctrine leads to the Church, as I have pointed out above, but until one is inside he is outside, and no amount of camouflage or throwing

of dust into the eyes of the crowd can disguise or blind one to that fact. Just so long as the position taken in the extract we have quoted is the position taken by anyone, just so long is that man a complete Protestant and *communicatio in sacris* with him is just as much a sin for a Catholic as it would be were it with the most bigoted of ultra-Protestants.

A chief reason for seeking the Catholic Church is to obtain the sanction of an unchanging authority, and thousands have done it for just that reason. Some of us had more or less "authority" where we were, but the question as to how much this amounted to was brought to the fore when one who had occupied the high office of bishop felt it necessary to lay aside that office and begin all over again, simply because he felt he did not possess real authority for his acts. Such a change wrought havoc in the High-Church camp, hence these frivolous attempts to belittle the whole matter. Being "Catholic minus the Pope" means leaving out and rejecting the one thing which makes the authority of the Catholic Church articulate, and which alone gives that authority a basis on which to stand. Hence "Catholic minus the Pope" is just as much Protestant as though it were minus every tenet of Catholic belief.

I do not like to accuse any of my former co-religionists of bad faith or insincerity, for I know how completely deceived one can be and how sincerely one may occupy the false position in which they are, but it does seem as though this were done deliberately, and for the purpose of keeping souls from finding out the truth. But "Woe to them that scandalize one of these little ones that trust in Me," said the Lord. May that "woe" not be their portion.

## The Growth of the Bishops' Press Bureau

MICHAEL WILLIAMS

IN a former article I have described the origin, the personnel, and something of the methods of the Press and Publicity Department of the National Catholic Welfare Council, established by the Hierarchy in September, 1919. I alluded to the fact that in a long and exceedingly valuable controversy which was pursued in the pages of AMERICA for several years previous to the momentous action taken by the Bishops, an idea favored by many of the contributors to the discussion was that possibly the best practical step toward the improvement of the Catholic press would be the formation of an international news-gathering and news-distributing bureau, controlled by ecclesiastical authority, but conducted by professional journalists. I also stated that this idea was adopted by the Hierarchy, although the plans of the Press and Publicity Department of the National Catholic Welfare Council embrace many other ideas than the one which is at present the principal work of the department. After showing in some detail how the system of news gathering



had been extended throughout this country and Europe, performing for the Catholic newspapers the same type of service that the Associated Press, the United Press, and the Universal Service performs for the secular papers, I stated that the manner in which this news service was developed would form the subject of a second article.

At the time when the N. C. W. C. Press Department was established there was already in operation a Catholic news bureau as part of the service performed by the Catholic Press Association, an organization formed by most of the Catholic newspapers and magazines for purposes of mutual benefit. Twenty-three of these periodicals subscribed to the news service gathered and distributed by the C. P. A. Thirteen of these subscribed for the cable service as well as for the domestic service. The service in its entirety consisted of a weekly Washington letter of a quasi-editorial character, and a news letter from Rome and one from London, together with a brief weekly cablegram from Rome and occasional cables from London; in all not more than from three to five columns of material being regularly distributed. Occasionally the C. P. A. also distributed an editorial article or a piece of fiction. It was recognized, however, and by none more clearly than by the members of the C. P. A. itself that this organization had not the means and was not in a position to secure the means adequately to carry on this very necessary work. Therefore, the first step taken by Bishop Russell and Father Burke, the first being the Chairman of the Press Department and the second the General Secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Council, after the Press Department was set up by the Hierarchy, was to submit the plan for an enlarged and more adequate news agency to the Catholic Press Association. The annual meeting of the Association was held in Washington, in January, 1920, and these are the words of the Right Rev. Chairman, Bishop Russell, in reporting back to the Hierarchy the results of this memorable convention:

A full agreement was reached between the Catholic Press Association and the Press Department, and I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to express my gratitude to the Catholic Press Association for its loyal and helpful attitude. I feel that the Catholic Press Association deserves words of the highest praise for its loyal Catholic response to the plans of the Hierarchy. The Association itself has maintained not only its independent existence, but by its affiliation with the larger work will add greatly to its membership and its strength.

This action by the Catholic Press Association enabled the Bishops' Press Department to begin its work with the good-will and active support of nearly all the Catholic publishers and editors of the country, a factor, of course, of inestimable value.

Not only did the Catholic newspapers display good-will toward the plan, but their quick and practical appreciation of the value of the material placed at their disposal by the extended news service was most gratifying, and it was distinctly profitable also. One diocesan paper which had gradually reduced its size to four pages, and

despite its high reputation for literary value had suffered a great loss in circulation, rapidly increased from four thousand to ten thousand readers after it began the use of the Bishops' News Service. And this experience, while rather extraordinary, was nevertheless not uncommon. A large number of papers have already reported distinct and marked increases in circulation. At the present time instead of twenty-three newspapers using three columns or so of syndicate matter weekly, as formerly, there are nearly seventy newspapers using what they care to use of about twenty to twenty-five columns of news placed at their disposal every week in addition to eight columns of editorial material supplied once a month, together with special articles or special news sent out from time to time when the occasion warrants that step. It may be added that this remarkable increase in the number of Catholic papers affiliated to the Bishops' Press Department has been accomplished despite the fact that the cost to each paper has necessarily increased. But these papers have found that the increase in the cost was more than compensated for by the increase in their circulation.

The material employed on the news sheet and in the mimeograph service, copious as it is, represents, however, only about fifty per cent of the total amount of material handled by the Press Department, which each week rejects almost as much material as it uses. It must be remembered, in this connection, that a special editorial problem has to be constantly studied in issuing news on a weekly basis. For example, an article may have great news value if it can be published immediately, but this value may be of such a character as to disappear if the article is retained for a week before it is published. Again, the Press Department must, as far as possible, anticipate the trend of events, and not wait until an interesting event has taken place. The Press Department is constantly suggesting topics to its correspondents at home and abroad with the intention of having important subjects dealt with in a timely manner.

The Press Department maintains what is known in newspaper technical language as a "future book," in which are entered memoranda concerning events known to be pending, such as Catholic conventions, meetings, or similar happenings. This enables the department to keep a systematic watch upon the unfolding of those events which can be anticipated.

The Exchange Department is an important factor in the work of the Press Bureau. In addition to providing the service with news and ideas for future "stories" and editorial possibilities, culled from the reading of twenty-one secular daily papers and sixty Catholic weeklies, and clippings from the same source for file references, it is the aim of the Exchange staff to call the attention of every department of the National Catholic Welfare Council to articles appearing in the Catholic and secular press pertinent to its particular work, and to provide clippings for same. Departments are not only furnished

with stories and articles, but with "follow-up," until the expiration of such publicity.

The files of the department contain not only thousands of clippings, documents, and pamphlets relative to Catholic activities throughout the world, but also hundreds of others pertaining to the international political situation and to other secular questions of the day which affect or may affect the interests of morality and religion.

Whenever there is Catholic news of general interest, the Press and Publicity Department of the National Catholic Welfare Council sends a report of such news to the Washington correspondents of the secular papers of the country and to the three press associations for general distribution. For example, the Pastoral Letter issued by the conference of Bishops last September was brought to the attention of the three press associations by a representative of the Press Bureau, who succeeded in having these associations distribute digests of the Pastoral at their own expense to all the secular newspapers of the country. The clippings collected on this one article alone fill a huge volume preserved in the archives of the department.

In September, 1920, when the report of the Press Department was read by its Episcopal chairman to the assembled Hierarchy at the Catholic University, it was received with marked favor and a resolution was voted

to continue the work along the lines laid down, and to use special efforts to develop it. The time had come, it was recognized, when an appeal on behalf of the Catholic press to the entire body of the Faithful, both clergy and laity, should be made in a most emphatic and practical fashion. It was felt to be especially desirable to use every possible effort to arouse the Catholic laity to a sense of the vital importance of Catholic press action, especially in the great emergency which now confronts civilization in Europe and in America. For this reason the Bishops unanimously voted to set aside a whole month as National Catholic Press Month, and March, 1921, was named a little later on by Bishop Russell, who immediately followed up this step by sending out a letter to the Archbishops and Bishops asking them to cooperate still further with the Press Department by notifying their pastors to speak to their people from the altars of all the Churches in the land, telling them that it is their duty vigorously to support and improve the Catholic press.

I hope to make the plans outlined by the Press Department for the National Catholic Press Month, plans which are receiving the hearty cooperation of Catholic editors, clergymen, and the intelligent laity throughout the land, the subject of another explanatory article in a very short time.

## Peace Temple or Tower of Babel?

GEORGE MEDWAY

**W**E have been frequently told that failure to ratify the Treaty of Versailles and the accompanying plan for a league of nations would be tantamount to betrayal of the tens of thousands of soldiers who gave their lives in the great conflict. Nevertheless, a large majority of our citizens has registered disapproval of the treaty and covenant at the ballot box. Among the voters who spoke in such unmistakable terms are fathers, mothers, brothers, and sisters of our fallen heroes. Who would dare accuse them of proving false to the ideals of our boys after supporting them so generously in their noble endeavor? Our citizenry seems rather to have voiced a growing conviction that the cause of our boys was repudiated by the very peace conference which was to develop in detail the great world contract entered into by the belligerents on Armistice Day.

President Wilson declared before Congress on February 3, 1917, that he had severed diplomatic relations with the German Government because it denied our trade rights and destroyed American lives and property at sea through its unlimited submarine warfare. His position was based on our traditional defense of the freedom of the seas. In his war speech of April 2, 1917, Mr. Wilson dwelt on autocracy. But Congress did not take cogni-

zance of his interpretation of the war as a crusade for democracy. It said: "... The state of war between the United States and the Imperial German Government which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared."

Perhaps this circumstance led President-Elect Harding to declare in his speech at Brownsville, Texas, on Armistice Day, 1920, that "we did not fight to make the world safe for democracy, though we were its best exemplars." However, President Wilson had idealized our war declaration, and the people became enthusiastic for the grand objects he outlined. Some even believed that all wars were to be abolished and all oppressed nations liberated. When the Germans laid down their arms on the basis of an agreement embodying the Fourteen Points of President Wilson the great victory of democracy seemed to have been clinched. The Allies were assumed to have accepted the great Wilsonian program when hard-pressed for help in the spring of 1917. After the armistice only the details remained to be written into what was to be a truly great peace document.

As the Versailles Conference with its secret sessions got under way most of the Fourteen Points became very dull, and cynics wrote a song of "Fourteen Little



Points" to the tune of "Ten Little Niggers." American idealism and sense of fair play were no match for old-world diplomacy, realism, greed, and revenge. Ireland was denied a hearing. The Egyptian delegation had the choice of going home or to prison. The Austrian Tyrol was ceded to Italy. We have the testimony of ex-Premier Bratiano, who was on the ground, that the "Big Five" lorded it over the conference. The Catholics of Slovakia were put under the domination of heretics and infidels, and the Church has been persecuted ever since. Hundreds of thousands of Hungarian Catholics were handed over to the Orthodox Rumanian Government, and the Catholic Slovenes and Croats had to bow to Orthodox Serbian rule. In the former German colonies numerous missions, directly under the Holy See, were ruined by the expulsion of missionaries. In defiance of all historic experience Austria was cut up so that Vienna became a huge waterhead of city population with only a small body of productive country to give it trade and sustenance.

Even Allied economists and writers have declared the treaty unworkable from a purely material viewpoint. Eminent Americans have deplored its cruel consequences. "The want and misery brought on by the war have been aggravated by the so-called peace," wrote Archbishop James J. Keane, D.D., of Dubuque, in an appeal for aid for the starving women and children in Europe. Had peace been signed a few months after the armistice and the hunger blockade promptly lifted, Central Europe could have imported food and raw material and gone to work. Much misery was bound to flow from the war, but it would not have increased to the present appalling proportions after an early and just peace.

It would be idle to apportion the guilt for this terrible situation. We leave that to the just God. The task to which all true friends of justice and mankind who realize the awful situation are bending their energies, is to save what can be rescued from the wreckage of war and godless diplomacy. American relief workers are giving truly heroic service in Poland, Austria, and other countries. Some of our people support this eminently Christian endeavor with generous contributions. They are mindful of the parable about the Good Samaritan and Christ's warning that at the Last Judgment the just will be rewarded and the wicked damned for what they have done or omitted to do for Him in the person of the hungry, the naked, and the afflicted.

But may we be content with charity as a means to restore normal conditions in Europe and Asia? Is this not mere skimming of the surface? Charity cannot remedy fully a condition due to injustice. Though America's duty to Christian civilization has been greatly exaggerated by diplomats and propagandists, who would have Uncle Sam act as keeper of the world's conscience, there is no gainsaying the fact that our country cannot hold aloof altogether. The World War has shown us how injustice, and dangers to civilization in one part of the

world are likely to react on nations on other continents. True peace between the nations is a blessing to civilization, and anything promoting civilization must be in the interests of America as the great champion of Christian democracy among nations. America decided the war and gave the Allies an opportunity to dictate the terms of Versailles. Our good faith was pledged to the armistice agreement, which was to have been the basis of the peace treaty. Are we not in justice bound to do all in our power to make good our plighted word and thereby save our honor? "Entangling alliances" are one thing; taking a determined stand for justice and at least denouncing crimes committed in the name of peace is something quite different.

The action of the Senate in withholding America's approval of the Treaty of Versailles may have been partly a political move. It was likewise an implicit recognition of this duty. But it was something negative. The time has come for constructive action. President-Elect Harding and the new Congress are committed to make a just peace as soon as possible. They are pledged to more than this. To meet the strong sentiment among our people for a real league as distinguished from the Versailles alliance of victors, Mr. Harding declared himself ready to cooperate with the Powers of Europe and Asia for the formation of a new association of nations based on justice and safeguarding our country's sovereignty. All Europe is clamoring for the aid of the United States in a concerted effort to avert another cataclysm. Allied statesmen have declared that our country can go into any association or league on its own terms. This situation offers a grand opportunity, which, however, is fraught with grave dangers to our traditional independence. Alien propagandists and financial interests as well as genuine Americans are generously supplying Mr. Harding with plans for a revision of the Versailles league or for an entirely new association. Having rejected a league which is contrary to American principles, there is danger that our people and their representatives will be taken off their guard and led into the same scheme in disguise.

Most of the proposed plans center around arbitration and a world court. Some are good as far as they go; but they do not touch the root of the evil, human passion and selfishness, which can be completely restrained only by God's law and Divine grace. Some writers leave the impression that, with the institution of a world court, the outlawing of war by an international conference, and other such things, all will be as peaceful as a purling brook on a lazy summer day. They seem to forget that the world had an international court at the Hague in 1914 which failed to hold in leash the dogs of war.

Without presuming to advise the incoming Administration on the conduct of our foreign affairs, one may point to a world-famous program, combining realism with idealism and outlined by the representative of the Prince of Peace and the sovereign of the world's oldest court, the Holy See, which has at its service the experience of

nearly two thousand years in diplomacy and government, an experience, surely, which no nation may neglect.

Pope Benedict, in his famous peace note of August 1, 1917, proposed three main principles: disarmament, arbitration, and freedom of the seas. His Holiness further urged the mutual condonation of war expenses as far as just; the evacuation of occupied territory; and proper regard for the aspirations of peoples under foreign rule. Five months later President Wilson issued his famous peace terms summarized under the Fourteen Points. They consist of the fundamental principles in the Pope's note, a more specific application of some of these, and the addition of one on open covenants and of another on a "general association of nations."

Part of this program (evacuation of some occupied lands, recognition of certain small nations, etc.) has been carried out. The principal points, disarmament, arbitration, and freedom of the seas, remain for the proposed League of Nations. As Pope Benedict has pointed out, armaments, particularly the permanent draft, are the most fruitful source of armed conflict. If Germany, Austria, Russia, France had not been possessed of large armies and navies in 1914 they would have given more time to negotiations. When men carry guns they like to use them. General Pershing drove home this point at a recent war relief meeting in New York City. Again, control of the sea by one nation or a group of nations will naturally provoke resentment and promote a counter-league or alliance among the peoples who are deprived of the free use of the waters intended for the benefit of all peoples. Freedom of the seas and disarmament of all forces not needed for domestic maintenance of order would pave the way to real, effective arbitration. Any world court worth the name implies disarmament and free seas. As long as the litigants are armed to the teeth the decision of the court will be accepted only when it meets the wishes of the powerful. "First of all, as a fundamental principle," says Pope Benedict, "the moral force of right must be substituted for the material power of arms." Effective arbitration implies trust in our neighbor's sense of honor and in the justice of the judges. This mental attitude is based on recognition of the moral law, the practical application of Christian ethics to the dealings between nations as well as to those between individuals. National selfishness and jingoistic flag worship, the idolatry of the modern world, must be subordinated to the precepts of Christ's law. Here is the only safe basis, solid as Gibraltar, on which to rear the temple of true peace. Without this foundation men are building their schemes for concord among nations on quicksand. Their purely humanitarian structure may temporarily avert war; but enduring peace presupposes a brotherhood of men in Christ under the fatherhood of God. In proportion as the nations turn to the Prince of Peace will they free themselves from the scourge of war and realize a federation of the world. Without Him as the Master Builder, they will rear another Tower of Babel.

## The Holy Office and the Y.M.C.A.

J. HARDING FISHER, S.J.

**I**N all the world, perhaps, there is no person whose sayings, actual and supposed, awaken more interest than those of the Holy Father. He is so prominent a figure and his words carry with them so great an authority over so many millions of men, that not only his children but countless others as well read with eagerness and discuss with earnestness everything that he says. Unfortunately, however, no public man's statements are subject to such serious misinterpretation as are the Pope's. The news items which appear in the public press concerning the Holy See are frequently inaccurate. Even when they are written with substantial accuracy, they are often so meager in details as to leave room for misunderstanding. This difficulty is further increased by the fact that those who report the statements said to emanate from the Vatican, to say nothing of those who read them, are at times not very well equipped by sympathy or habits of thought to appreciate correctly either the Church's point of view or the documents' actual meaning.

The recent letter sent by the Holy Office to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on certain non-Catholic associations is an instance in point. It is precise in thought, unequivocal in language, and definite in its instructions; it has been published so widely that any one who cares to do so, can read it either in the original or in translations. Under these circumstances misconception as to its original contents would appear to be impossible. The impossible has taken place, and the letter has been lamentably misunderstood.

One of the mistakes attaching to popular accounts of the letter is that which assigns the authorship of it to the Pope. As a matter of fact, the letter is not the Pope's. It emanated from the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, and bears the signature of Cardinal Merry del Val, who, in issuing it, acted in his capacity as Secretary of the Congregation. This mistake, however, is not of great moment, because the Pope is the Prefect of the Holy Office and the letter would not have been published without his authorization and approval.

Another of the minor misrepresentations created by inadequate press accounts represents the letter as wholly concerned with the Y. M. C. A. This is not the case. The letter deals with an entire class of associations which the Holy Office judges to be dangerous to Catholics and to the Faith. Only one paragraph is devoted to the "Y," and if it is singled out for special mention, the reason is that the Young Men's Christian Association is the most widespread and the best equipped of the organizations in question, and is the quasi-parent of many others. Here again, the undue prominence given to the "Y" is of lesser consequence, because it is certainly included among the associations to which the Sacred Congregation takes exception.



Still another misconception, of a distinctly inimical nature, is being spread, to the effect that the letter is a "Bull of Anathema." The letter is not a Papal bull in any sense of the word, nor can it justly be described as an excommunication, for the Church does not excommunicate corporations, that penalty is reserved for persons, individually or collectively, and by its very nature to such persons as are members of the Catholic Church. The purpose of the letter is to convey instructions to Catholic pastors, and particularly to the members of the Hierarchy, to devise ways and means of safeguarding the young people committed to their care from losing their Catholic faith. In speaking of the associations concerned, the document merely describes their well known activities, the self-avowed and officially proclaimed motives which underlie these activities, and the danger both in tendency and effect which such activities controlled by such motives present to young Catholics.

The extent to which the character of the letter is being misrepresented, either from ignorance or malice, is seen, to take but a single instance, in the Los Angeles *Scottish Rite Bulletin*, which declares in its issue for January, 1921, that the Pope has "pronounced a curse on the 'Y' for its activities in applied Christianity." This statement is so patently at variance with the truth that it is hard to understand how any one who had read even casually the letter could have made it.

There is not a single word in the letter which can be construed as an objection to the humanitarian work, as such, carried on either by the Young Men's Christian Association or by any of the other organizations. In fact Cardinal Merry del Val goes out of his way to pay a tribute to the "Y" for the important services it rendered to a large number of unhappy persons during the World War. He calls attention to the fact that both the "Y" and the other associations are possessed of large material resources and are engaged in many fields of beneficence; that the "Y" is supported by non-Catholics of good faith who believe, mistakenly but sincerely, that the association is beneficial to all and harmful to none; that the "Y" professes sincere love for young people and that its avowed object is to promote their material and mental interests. With the efforts of the "Y" in applied Christianity and its endeavors to provide young people with homes in large cities, with a wholesome moral atmosphere, with facilities for building up strong and healthy bodies, and with an education, the Holy Office finds no fault whatever. Not the use but the misuse of these activities is the reason why the Holy Office has sounded a warning against them. They are dangerous to Catholics, the letter declares, because they are being made the occasion and the means of propaganda of doctrines which the Holy Office deems prejudicial to the best interests of Catholic young people, because the material and educational advantages offered by the associations in question are being employed to instil habits of thought which the Holy Office judges to be un-Christian,

because the culture given by them destroys in its beneficiaries the integrity of Catholic faith, robs the Church of her children and eventuates in rationalism and religious indifferentism.

This tendency and effect are not, according to the Cardinal, a sort of by-product of the work of the associations in question, something unforeseen, undesired and regretted, but a deliberate purpose, openly proclaimed in the organs of their propaganda. He declares that, according to their own assertions made in pamphlets, newspapers and periodicals, their object is to impart intellectual and moral culture which shall be their religion, and shall consist in full and complete liberty of thought outside and independently of every religion and denomination. The steps by which this object is accomplished, the letter states, is "to lead them insensibly, first to hesitate between contrary opinions, then to doubt about everything, and finally to settle down in a sort of vague, indefinite religion, which is, to say the least, a very different religion from that which was preached by Jesus Christ." Professing to give light to young people, they turn them away from the Church's authoritative teaching body, which has been Divinely established as the light of truth, and urge them to seek light for their own guidance from their own interior spirit and from unaided human reason. The consequence is that the young boys and young girls who come under their influence are despoiled of the precious patrimony of the Faith.

That the Young Men's Christian Association is actually accomplishing this same result and that it proposes to itself this same end, Cardinal Merry del Val says explicitly:

This society, indeed, makes profession of a sincere love for young people, as if it had no dearer aim than to give them facilities for corporal and mental development; but at the same time it destroys their faith and declares that it proposes to purify it, and to impart a more perfect knowledge of life, "above and apart from any religious system."

In proof of his statement he refers to the pamphlet published by the central office of the Y. M. C. A. in Rome, "*Che cosa è la Y. M. C. A.: cio che si propone, etc.*" Such being the object of the associations with which the letter deals, the Holy Office, in the exercise of its function of watching over purity of faith and morals, bids the Catholic clergy, and especially the Bishops, to safeguard the young people over whom they have charge from the danger with which in their ignorance they are threatened.

The letter, as might be expected, has already been made the subject of considerable comment, but no one is surprised or seriously disturbed by it. When people are wholly at variance on fundamental principles, it is inevitable that they should differ widely on the application of those principles. Catholicism and religious indifferentism are poles apart as far as their basic positions are concerned, and as a consequence their canons of judgment and their standards of value as far as they

depend on these basic positions, are, and must be, irreconcilable. The Pope is committed heart and soul, completely and unreservedly to each and every portion of Divine Revelation; his critics discard that Revelation altogether, or have whittled it away to suit their own views, or else assent to it only in so far as it approves itself to unaided human reason. The Pope regards it as his bounden duty to defend the Faith from any movement that threatens its integrity; his critics resent any such Papal action as an effort to fetter human freedom. This being the case, it is futile to look for agreement where there is no ground for agreement.

Catholics, therefore, do not expect that the measures taken by the Head of the Church to keep the Faith intact shall meet with the approval of those who have little or no appreciation of his views of the Faith. All that they demand is that the Pope and the Sacred Congregations

shall be treated with the same fairness with which enemies of the Church are treated by the Church; that the Holy See and its statements shall be given a fair hearing, that they shall not be made to say what they have not said, that they shall not be misrepresented. Unfortunately, however, misrepresentation of the recent letter has already begun, and if the lessons of history count for anything, the false reports of its contents are likely to be repeated with increasing vehemence and frequency until they at last parade as unchallengeable truth. Catholics and the Y. M. C. A. differ on the value of the culture which is offered by the "Y" and similar associations. There is no reason why, in this country especially, they should not differ amicably, without bitterness. It would be a thing much to be regretted if this difference should give rise to religious animosity, especially now, when the country is so distracted.

## Senator King on the Smith Bill

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

SENATOR KING'S denunciation of the Smith-Towner bill was delivered in the Senate of the United States very appropriately on the birthday of that great American, Abraham Lincoln. As the Senator well observed, the struggle in Lincoln's day was to preserve the Union against decentralizing tendencies, "but the struggle now is to save the States from the centralizing forces operating through the Federal Government." The daily press published the speech of Senator Smith with some fulness, but could find little space for the reply of Senator King, a splendid defense of the Constitution, and an able presentation of the reasons why millions of Catholic Americans oppose the Smith-Towner bill. Unfortunately, Senator King's speech cannot be quoted here in its entirety; its spirit can be judged by the following extracts:

"Within the Catholic Church are millions who believe in local self-government and the splendid individualism which Christianity inspires. They see in legislation which strikes at the roots of personal liberty, individual responsibility, and at the rights of the sovereign States, a menace to our Government and its institutions. In my opinion, the opposition of Catholics rests largely upon grounds that ought to appeal to all patriotic Americans, namely, that this bill is in line with policies and influences at work in this land to weaken individual initiative and character, the spirit of independence and personal responsibility, the desire and the capacity for local self-government, and to reduce the States to feeble and helpless subdivisions of a powerful, paternalistic government, whose authority is supreme in local and in national concerns. I believe that many members of this Church fear

the efforts to standardize the lives and the thoughts of the people, as well as the social, political and economic conditions in the land. They fear as many others fear, the evils of this design to secure uniformity in education, and in all things possessing social value.

"The centripetal forces now operating this Republic—and this bill is one of the manifestations of such forces—tend to bring about a standard of uniformity in the lives, the thoughts, the customs, of the people of the United States, and that standard of uniformity is to be determined in Washington, by the forces of bureaucracy and not by the people themselves, or as the result of evolutionary forces operating in the local communities and States. . . . If we establish this Federal agency to aid in education, safeguards will in time be thrown off, and there will be established in Washington an autocratic power that will standardize and bureaucratize and reduce to a dead level uniformity the educational systems of the States of the Union. Not only that; it will not be content with standardizing education, but it will standardize the thoughts of the people, and if the people of [a given] State are not in harmony with the Federal system of thought, then they will be denied appropriations, or pressure will be brought by the Federal Government to compel the people of the State to renounce views which are regarded as heretical. We are to have an orthodox educational system, and a cellular uniformity in the social and political structure. Germany standardized everything; her philosophy finally produced uniformity and pernicious policies.

"The progress of the world comes from heterogeneity rather than from homogeneity. What is needed is not



protoplasmic masses, but active contesting units. The civilizing force of Christianity is found in the doctrine that each individual . . . is saved, not in groups, but individually, as a result of his own efforts, and the purity and righteousness of his own life. . . . Mr. President, we need variety in life, differences in the thoughts and activities of the various sections. . . . But the Senator [Senator Smith] by his policy, and that is the policy of so many in this country, wants the power of the Federal Government exerted in the States to control and influence their domestic affairs. . . . When we create a Federal agency as powerful as this one [the proposed Department of Education] will develop to be, the end will be inevitable.

"The bill is more dangerous than some of those that bear more strikingly upon their countenances the determination to destroy State lines, because it is so seductive and alluring. It burglarizes while it professes friendship, and to be the bearer of beneficent gifts. It steals into the States under the guise of an angel of mercy and light, for the purpose of striking down the individuality and personal independence of the inhabitants of the States, and ultimately strangling the spirit of community life and of State rights. . . . It must be apparent to all that the movements for Federal participation in the domestic affairs of the State can have but one end, the submergence of the States, and that the current carrying them on will consolidate all authority in a centralized government functioning in Washington. . . . I make the prediction that the bill of the Senator from Georgia, if it shall pass, will have this effect; it will ultimately mean that the States will cease to function along educational lines, and will leave the matter of education entirely to the Federal Government. . . .

"What is it that determines the growth, the prosperity, the progress of a people? What is that that will shape the future of this Republic? It is the education of the people. *If we permit the bureaucratization of education, if we permit a centralized agency here to determine how we shall think, to determine the school books we shall have, to determine the model of thought of the people, to guide the lives of children—if we do that, then, Mr. President, it is manifest that we are destroying the foundations of the Republic.*

"I deny the authority of the Federal Government to tax the people of Utah or of Massachusetts to educate the people of Texas. The Senator from Georgia spoke about the general welfare. Whenever legislation is projected which cannot find any constitutional foundation on which to rest, men arise to say that it is for the general welfare, and that under the general welfare clause of the Constitution of the United States we may do these things. I do not need to talk to lawyers about what the general welfare clause is, and what are the limitations of the Federal Government. The Federal Government is the creature of the States. The States reserved to themselves, to determine their own internal affairs, and

one of the highest responsibilities and functions of a State is to provide a system of education. I deny the right of the Federal Government to tax the people of New York to educate the people of my State, and I deny the right of Congress to take money out of the Federal Treasury and to disburse it throughout the United States for purely local purposes. I know it will be said these views are obsolete. Senators have said to me upon a number of occasions when I have been pleading for the rights of the States that such views would have been sound a few years ago, but that they have been outgrown. The contention is that this is a progressive age, and progress is to be measured by our departure from fundamentals. Some things never grow old. Age does not sanctify error, or transform a violation of the Constitution into a right. The Constitution is the Constitution now, as it was when it came from the hands of the Fathers. It should be as sacred now as in the past, and those who are sworn to defend it, ought to be the first to resist encroachments or measures that invade the States. . . .

"The Senator from North Carolina seems to challenge my right to speak for the Catholic Church. I do not deny his challenge. I do not belong to that great organization that builds for the future, that has a profound philosophy in its creed and system in its organization and dreams as to its future spiritual and moral power in the world, which command the admiration even of those who oppose it. The Senator from Georgia spoke of the Catholic organizations which are opposing this bill, and attempted to interpret this opposition as resting only, if I understood him correctly, upon what he alleged to be their misconception of the power of this bill to control absolutely the educational system. I proceeded to state that I did not think the position of the Senator from Georgia quite accurate: that in addition to those reasons for their opposition, they were opposing it on the further ground that it was an invasion of the rights of individuals and of the States; and I alluded to the fact that Cardinal Gibbons had repeatedly lifted his voice in this Republic on behalf of democracy and personal liberty, and the maintenance of the rights of local self-government. His position, and that of other Catholics, if I understand them, is that they are not in harmony with any scheme which would weaken the States, affect the rights of the people, or increase the authority of the Federal Government beyond constitutional limitations."

The attempt to inject into the discussion of constitutional principles the bitterness of religious bigotry is beneath contempt. But will the American ideals enunciated by Senator King prevail? If they are destroyed by the creation through the Smith-Towner bill of a Federal dictatorship over education within the States, then the American Republic as founded by our fathers, is at an end. It is already struggling under serious and even sinister difficulties imposed upon it by ill-advised politicians.

## COMMUNICATIONS

*Letters as a rule should not exceed six hundred words*

## Letter from the Cardinal Archbishop of Vienna

To the Editor of AMERICA:

As I have learned from my delegates for the Catholic Relief in Austria, the Rev. Joseph Egger and the Baroness von Rast, and as I have personally ascertained from various issues of AMERICA, this review has devoted itself to the service of our good cause in an exemplary manner, and has secured for our Catholic Relief many and notable offerings, as a result of its continued appeals.

The need and destitution of the middle classes in our sorely tried Fatherland clamor for still further assistance. The readers of AMERICA have given richly and whole-heartedly. With their offerings many a burning need was relieved in many an afflicted home. But the end of our misery is not yet in sight. Families of the middle classes dare not even think of purchasing underwear, shoes or clothing, or indeed anything that is not absolutely necessary just to sustain life. Amid such conditions it is consoling to know that we have friends and self-sacrificing helpers in a distant land. May God lavishly reward all kind helpers and donors.

Vienna.

✦ FR. G. CARD. PIFFL.

## General Forrest

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I read with regret the communication in your issue of February 5 under the caption "Lincoln versus Lloyd George." After the mists of hatred and ill-will have rolled away, and that gallant soldier General Nathan B. Forrest has been vindicated by friend and foe alike, it seems a pity that the egregious false statements of the sub-committee appointed by Congress in 1864 and sent from Washington to investigate the so-called "Massacre of Fort Pillow" should be used as an evidence of President Lincoln's magnanimity in not ordering reprisals.

At that time, the statements of the committee were proved false by the testimony of those taking part in the fight, both Confederate and Federal officers of undoubted reputation and unquestioned honor. In the "Life of General Nathan Bedford Forrest" by Dr. John Allan Wyeth, published by Harper Bros., in 1899, Chapter 14 gives a complete history of the capture of Fort Pillow, and absolutely refutes the slanderous charges brought against Forrest. Point by point, the report of the sub-committee is disproved by sworn statements of men whose names are on the honor roll of both sides. I ask your correspondent, in a spirit of fairness, to get this book from any Public Library and read Chapter 14.

The Confederacy was short-lived, but it died without dishonor. It was truly said of her by Philip Stanley Worsley in verses sent with his "Translation of Homer's Iliad" to General Robert E. Lee

" . . . but let her bear  
This blazon, to the end of Time,  
No Nation rose so white and fair,  
Or fell so pure of crime."

Baltimore.

CORA PAYNE SHRIVER.

## The Ku Klux Comedians

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Mr. John B. Kennedy, in "The Ku Klux Comedians," which appeared in AMERICA of January 29, says: "There was nothing sufficient to explain that panic; but it was real and the Ku Klux Klan, silly though it was, in a measure relieved that panic." In the preceding sentence he refers to the South as "ruined and riven," after speaking of the bitter days of the Southern people at the close of the war. Who but carpet-baggers, in the wake of Sherman, Butler, Hunter and others who practised Black and Tan methods, made it ruined and riven? Poverty

the Southern people could stand, but they did not have to endure conditions which the Ku Klux Klan was organized to remedy. Until Mr. Kennedy understands the conditions of those days he had better refrain from saying there was nothing sufficient to explain the panic and from applying "silly" to the Klan that was organized by the gallant general, Nathan Bedford Forrest. When the North learns to let alone subjects on which it is not able to pass judgment, much will have been accomplished in the way of fairness.

Washington.

ELLEN FOLEY.

## Pilgrims and Puritans Again

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I fear I cannot agree with Dr. Walsh that he and I are "just using words at cross purposes." May I restate our main points of difference?

(1) Dr. Walsh began with the assertion that the Pilgrims of 1620 founded Harvard College, and on their arrival "proceeded at once to establish schools in every little town and hamlet." To this I objected by saying that the Puritans, of Boston Bay, not the Pilgrims of 1620, founded Harvard, and that while the Puritans established elementary schools at an early date, the Pilgrims were so backward in this work that they did not really begin it until about 1670, or nearly fifty years after the landing at New Plymouth.

(2) At this Dr. Walsh, without retracting his obvious errors, advanced the defense that the distinction between the Pilgrims and the Puritans "is so slight that it is not worth making." Whereat I replied by showing that the Pilgrims of 1620 and the Puritans of the Massachusetts Bay Colony differed (a) in religious allegiance, (b) in the origin of their respective grants, (c) in the date of their several foundations, and (d) in the somewhat notable circumstance that until about 1692, New Plymouth and the Bay Colony were political governments as distinct as colonial New Hampshire and New York.

(3) To this cannonading Dr. Walsh returned fire with a couple of small-bore guns. To establish the identity of the 1620 Pilgrims and the Puritans of Massachusetts Bay so completely that it would enable him to say that the 1620 Pilgrims founded Harvard, Dr. Walsh cited the testimony of two unnamed gentlemen who in an after-dinner conversation "used Pilgrim and Puritan quite indiscriminately," and the remarks of a "novelist in responding to a toast at a banquet. At this, I exploded a mine, as I fondly thought, by refusing to allow that the toast of a novelist and the post-prandial conversation of two gentlemen, were sufficient to overturn the fact admitted by standard historians, that the Pilgrims of 1620 were not identical with the later settlers at and about Boston Bay.

(4) Finally, Dr. Walsh, no longer insisting that the distinction is "so slight as not to be worth making," advances to the charge with the assertion that the distinction "is a recent introduction." Writing in AMERICA T. F. M. noted that the term "Pilgrim" was used in 1650, but, recent or ancient, I do not see the bearing of the observation. Does Dr. Walsh wish me to understand that the distinction, because it is "recent," is suspect, or not worth making, or misleading or false, or a needless refinement?

Whatever the extent of the popular error in confounding Pilgrim and Puritan, surely it is no part of the historian's office to encourage error, however general. And in the present instance, the historical truth is that the distinction between the Pilgrims of 1620 and the Puritan settlers in the Massachusetts Bay Colony is neither "so slight as not to be worth making" nor "a recent introduction," nor "a needless refinement." If it is disregarded, some one may again repeat the absurdity of attributing the establishment of Harvard College to the Pilgrims of New Plymouth.

New York.

WARREN LENDRUM.



### The Labor Value Theory

To the Editor of AMERICA:

My letter in AMERICA of January 15, did contain a personal reference, not presented in the spirit of self-laudation, but as an apology for my temerity in entering into a discussion with Dr. Pallen. I expected that advantage would be taken of its weakness. It is amazing, however, that Dr. Pallen should state that the expressions of a recognized teacher of Socialism and of the Church have no place in considering whether the labor-value theory is Socialist or not. Yet, on occasion, he takes the position that, "What the New York *Call* eagerly applauds and embraces as its own is not merely 'pleasing to Socialists,' but is Socialist."

Certainly, I agree with Dr. Pallen that what made value in the Middle Ages makes value now. But mere capital in that period brought no profit to its owner. "Utility as raised or lowered by the difficulty of attainment made value then as it makes it now." Personally, I would be glad to accept that statement. I only vary it to make it intelligible to those whom I am trying to reach. Can there be any other meaning of "difficulty of attainment" than necessary labor, or necessary effort? Then it can be fairly, and accurately, composed into the following: Utility as raised or lowered by the necessary labor of attainment makes value.

But then we have it that utility requiring no labor has no value. And, accordingly, utility requiring one unit of necessary labor possesses one unit of value. Therefore, labor is the measure of value. Can there be any other conclusion? When Dr. Pallen says that value is the measure of value, he is stating a truism, but not explaining anything. "Price is not value." Of course not! But the price (money) paid for a commodity has a value equal to the price of the commodity.

The only other point in the sole paragraph in his letter in which he criticizes my presentation of the labor-value theory, has reference to the effect of economic forces on prices, "which are always fluctuating, like the tides." The fact that such fluctuation exists is apparent to all. I think Dr. Pallen puts it in the words of any Socialist who is a believer in "economic determinism." There is the implication that there are other than man-made "economic forces." Therein is the main difference between Dr. Pallen and myself. If wrong "economic forces" are permitted to prevail, there is no recourse for the Church, or for any of us, but to "sanction" foreign trade, interest on mere capital, bureaucratic government, and even Smith-Towner schools.

I am surprised that Dr. Pallen, being such a stickler for exactitude, should charge Socialism with claiming for the workman "the full value of the product," with nothing for capital. Socialists are generally credited with claiming for the worker "the full value of the product of his labor," allowing capital the amount of its depreciation in the production process, which approximates ten per cent of the value of the product. But, in fact, Socialism makes no claim that can be interpreted as demanding justice for anyone; it knows only "economic determinism," which seems to have some unconscious influence on Dr. Pallen.

What I am proposing can be indicated briefly by an excerpt from a communication in AMERICA, of February 7, 1920:

There are some who maintain that there is no equitable distribution of wealth unless all the product, less the amount of the depreciation of capital, goes to the workers. And, of course, that is the ideal condition; which can be approximated only by retaining the equivalent of a community's product within the community. This would bring into existence an abundance of capital within a certain territory, and then capital would tend to receive no greater share of the produce than the amount of its depreciation, or what it lost in the producing process. Labor then would get its full reward.

In conclusion, I regret that Dr. Pallen did not see fit to name economic terms I used, and the confusion of which he declines the task of unraveling. But, it does not require any hair-split-

ting definitions to maintain that labor is the measure of value; those who argue against it prove the proposition. When the opportunity comes to explain how it is that labor now gets the full value of its product, despite exploitation, it will be necessary to elaborate its presentation in the detail that Dr. Pallen requires in defining "teleological," which De Quincey briefs as follows: "Teleologic value is the extreme limit of value in exchange." In an article entitled "The Drive for Free Trade," which appeared in AMERICA, for February 16, 1918, I wrote as follows:

If the people of a tropical land acquired, or were educated to, a liking for whiskey and shirts, the price they would have to pay the foreign capitalist in their labor for such commodities would not be the cost price, plus the profit available in his home market, but the price that could be secured to him through the desire of the savages for the articles, coupled with their inability to produce them.

It now appears that I was illustrating the word before I knew its meaning.

M. P. CONNERY.

### Make Greek Optional

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Why not? "It would be ruinous," it is said. "Drop Greek, and Latin would be the next to go, and there would be an end of all classical training." Such a reason is really an admission of weakness. It amounts to this: a language (Greek), which is itself useless, must screen another, whose claims are unconvincing. Two studies, Latin and Greek, each unable to defend itself, are used to defend each other.

On the other hand, make Greek optional and we strengthen our position as teachers of the Classics. Most students of obligatory Greek derive no more advantage from it than they would from Latin alone. The peculiar advantage of Greek over Latin is its training of the imagination and its training in literary expression. For this purpose the rich Greek literature is vastly superior to the meager Latin. But the number of students who are capable of this literary training is, as every teacher of languages knows, comparatively small. We shall not underestimate it, if we say it is ten per cent of the whole, the proportion of young men who yearly matriculate for Oxford from the English schools. The only advantage that the other ninety per cent derive from the study of Greek is the training of mind and the training in plain prose expression; but for all practical purposes this training is gained just as effectively from the study of Latin alone.

"Yes, but marking Greek 'optional' means 'this way out.' Pupils, even the capable ten per cent, will abandon it *en masse* as being 'too hard.'" Not if we have a proper alternative for Greek, which is just as hard as Greek, but hard in a different way. Science and mathematics and, perhaps, a really scientific history course at once suggest themselves as subjects which to a literary mind would be just as hard as Greek would be to a scientific mind. If, with such an alternative, a pupil chooses to abandon Greek, it will not be through preference for a snap course but purely because of his greater fitness for other work.

Finally we must remember that Greek taught in this way, as an optional subject, to students who like it and are capable of profiting by it, is going to justify itself. At present most of the outcry against Greek comes from those who submitted to Greek in their own school days as a cruel necessity, having had no natural inclination for it. Now they are having their revenge by hounding it to death. Make Greek optional in the way suggested above and at one stroke you paralyze your adversaries, you cut off their supply of men and ammunition. Moreover with better teachers because more select, better pupils because all literary, and better instrument than any other, namely, the Classical Greek, everything is conspiring towards the noble output of a truly literary mind.

Poughkeepsie.

W. T. TALLON, S.J.

# A M E R I C A

## A · CATHOLIC · REVIEW · OF · THE · WEEK

### SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1921

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by The America Press, New York.  
President, RICHARD H. TIERNY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSEIN;  
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN.

#### SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00  
Canada, \$4.50 Europe, \$5.00

#### Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

### Race and Religious Prejudices

SERIOUS, thoughtful men have begun to take thought about the race and religious prejudices that have been stirred up in America, since Armistice Day. Unfortunately, at a time when union of mind and heart is imperative, discord is rife, and as usual the Catholic and Jew are the objects of attack. The attack itself is a matter of small concern to fair-minded men, for they realize that to indict a race or a religion for the defects of a few members or adherents is a folly that will soon be laughed out of court. However, there is an element of rather thin mystery about the present campaign that calls for comment and warning. Generally those who pull the wires in these sordid plays are content to see Protestants baying at the heels of Catholics, but, now, Jews are pitted against Christians, Christians against Jews, Protestants against Catholics, Catholics against Protestants. Why, we wonder? Has the present European tangle any relation to this maze of clenched fists and flying heels? Perhaps not. But if not, it is hard to explain the presence amongst us of so many plausible and patent propagandists who after the fashion of their tribe are trading on the reputation of reputable citizens, and religious. And their story is always told with such meticulous care for details that it smells of midnight oil and conning by day. Moreover, the men and associations that are most savage and insistent in attacks on Catholics, are equally well known for their love of ways, political philosophies and aspirations that are not native but foreign.

All this is worthy of attention and deep reflection. But unfortunately our people are not fond of mental effort. They are only too willing to lend ear to every itinerant propagandist who assumes lofty airs and profound knowledge in order to impress the inferior "American race." Happy for our country when we learn to weigh evidence at least well enough to reach conclusions that will put us on our guard against alien influences that are brought to bear upon us in time of crises.

This is a time of a great crisis; alien influences are being brought to bear upon us; the present racial and religious turmoil is factitious, not spontaneous: Americans, especially Catholics, should be on guard. "Watch your step" is excellent advice just at present.

### What is an "Open Shop"?

AN attack upon the National Catholic Welfare Council, as well as on the Federal Council of Churches, for their attitude towards the open-shop question has been sent, presumably, to every clergyman in the United States. It is a reprint from *Industry* and defends the "open-shop" drive as now conducted by certain groups of employers and employers' associations. With no bias in this controversy the neutral observer cannot fail to see the disingenuousness of this document in quoting the sentiments expressed in favor of the "open shop" by the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce and the Bankers' Association, as expressive of popular opinion. These organizations, though not without a sprinkling of professional men, as the representatives of the Catholic Bishops correctly state in their answer, are as a body emphatically on the employers' side in any industrial controversy, and little more impartiality need be expected from the National Grange. Whether their views actually express the popular opinion is quite another question. But what, after all, is the meaning of an "open shop"?

Men like Mr. Eugene R. Grace are clear and outspoken in the significance they attach to this term, while the action of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation has been equally unequivocal. They openly declare, by word and deed, that it implies a fight upon the unions throughout their entire industry. Whatever we may think of this, we have here at least a clean-cut issue. They stand for the employers' closed shop, a shop strictly closed to the union as such. Mr. Cheney, Secretary of the Erectors' Association, went still further when he plainly stated that both his own organization and the National Fabricators' Association understood by the open shop, "a shop in which the foremen are expected to see to it that there are no union men." Here there is question, then, of a shop, closed not merely to the union, but to all union men. It is in the strictest sense an employers' closed shop, around which the controversy avowedly turns in this particular instance, and not an open shop in any sense.

But the great National Association of Manufacturers does not pause at this point in its anti-union campaign. It refuses to admit collective bargaining even though confined within the individual plants and separated from all outside influences. "The spokesman for the National Association of Manufacturers," says the N. C. W. C., "was informed that if that body would make a public statement to the effect that the 'open shop' is consistent with proportional representation by the union employees in a system of collective bargaining, even confined to the individual shop, the Social Action Depart-



ment of the National Catholic Welfare Council would withdraw its statement against the 'open shop.' He at once flatly refused to make such a statement and admitted that it was the association's desire to cripple the unions. Similarly the secretary of the Associated Employers of Indianapolis, Mr. Andrew Allen, regarded as perhaps the foremost promoter of this movement, has without hesitation defined the "open-shop" as one in which the employer makes contracts with the employees as individuals only.

There is evidently then a great confusion of terms in referring to this movement under the shibboleth of the "open shop," since there are as many definitions as there are different interests. This becomes all the more apparent when we consider the definition given to this expression by the National Catholic Welfare Council when it speaks of the open shop as "one in which no discrimination is practised against either union or non-union employees, but in which the union members are permitted a share in collective bargaining with the employer."

#### Monkey Marriages

A FEW days since there was a "monkey marriage" at Palm Beach, attended, so the public prints state, by "society people who were not ashamed to profess relationship with their simian progenitors." Though the press reports were vague and no doubt exaggerated, yet they clearly and humorously defined the status of the spectators of this horrible mockery of a sacred ceremony. In view of this fact, perhaps the incident might well be passed over in silence. But, on the other hand, it is pertinent to remark that people who find pleasure in such a travesty of marriage have fallen far below the standard of taste usually accredited to men and women of even elementary cultivation. True, they were members of our best families, as one of the papers had it, meaning no doubt, that they were members of a small group of new-rich people who, off stage and on stage, are always willing to throw restraint to the winds in order to win a line or two in the society column of a provincial paper. But though this may explain the animal antics of Palm Beach, yet it does not excuse them. Even the new rich have obligations both to themselves and to others. And though it may be too much to expect them to observe all such obligations, yet it is assuredly proper to demand that they respect the reticences that are the heritage of all civilizations.

An unfortunate feature of all these wanton displays of disregard for sacred ceremonies and institutions is that women generally instigate them and play the most prominent part in them. The reason for this is hard to discern. Perhaps women's emotions are more easily perverted than men's, or it may be that woman is more lawless than man. Be that as it may, this is certain: woman, not man, is the chief sufferer from such crass displays of perverted instincts, as monkey marriages.

Every blow at matrimony is a blow at woman. The bonds of marriage are a refuge and protection to her. These weakened or destroyed, woman becomes the victim of passions not easily checked. And mock marriages between animals are clearly a blow at matrimony. By their nature they induce men to look the more lightly on a sacred institution of nature, that has been sanctified by God. And the result is tribulation and then anguish for the very ones for whom marriage was intended to be a source of joy; women, the cause of their own downfall.

#### The British Premier and Ireland

THE British Premier has spoken once again on Ireland, and in the usual manner. His speech consisted of a large number of high-sounding phrases that conveyed but one idea: the Irish are an ungrateful, murderous lot and the British are an altogether unselfish people burning with a great and holy desire to save Ireland from a small faction of bandits known as Sinn Fein. This, of course, is a hollow if comfortable non-Conformist assumption, whose sole foundation lies in the elastic conscience of an astute politician who is anxious to divert public attention from the savage crimes of his Government. But unfortunately for Lloyd George, he and his satellites have turned this clumsy trick so often that men smile in derision at it and reflect afresh on the facts, with renewed sympathy for a nation that is obliged to submit to rulers whose only norm of morality is expediency.

Sinn Fein is not a faction, nor is it a mere policy; it is a national aspiration that cannot be suppressed by fire and sword. Rather these weapons make it strong, for a noble soul scorns torch and steel, and Ireland's soul is noble.

Lloyd George may talk from the tribune till doomsday about murder gangs and outrages on law and order, and all that, but the spirit of Ireland will still go marching on to liberty, unafraid, unhurt, for God is its guide.

And the goal is not far distant. Unity and patience a while longer, and Erin will be in the valley of vision, freed by the courage of her people who knew their cause was just and were determined to vindicate it.

#### "Slice of Life" Novels

IT is worthy of note that the publishers of "realistic" novels are much given to calling their output "slice of life" novels. In a story of that kind, the editor of the *New Statesman* shrewdly observes:

Great care will have been taken about the representation of material objects and character. But the material objects will, usually, be grimy, and the characters will invariably be weak. Nobody will (although in "real life," people often do) lead a happy existence or even die an honorable death. Nobody will marry the person he or she ought to marry, nobody will have the strength to resist any temptation or to dare any decisive action, nobody will laugh (save bitterly) nobody will make festival or feel the sun. The term, "a slice of life," applied to a book

certainly advises us that we need not fear (if we are disposed to fear) any "romantic nonsense," but it also promises us that we shall read about people far more uniformly miserable and impotent than the generality of men.

A striking characteristic of the "slice of life" novels, as Dr. Maurice Francis Egan points out on this page of AMERICA, is the hopeless paganism of the men and women portrayed in them. The principles of Christianity seem to have but scant place in the thoughts of these people and but little influence on their lives. For the most part they think, talk and act as if Our Divine Lord had never come into this world to teach us how to gain another. Drab and somber secularism appear to be an essential note of our all too numerous "slice of life" novels.

At its worst this type of story is no less devoid of artistry than of decency. An instance in point is a vile book perpetrated by one of our numerous "martyrs of puritan narrowness," a novel which Mr. Richard Le Gallienne, who is hardly a prude, recently described as a wretched piece of "patchwork" which its author made up of "all that is least estimable" in another indecent

writer, thus presenting us with the most tiresome and "erotic cad to be found between the covers of a book." Yet this "inartistic," noisome slice of life novel has become, Mr. Le Gallienne remarks, "the Bible for the most part of all those half-baked intellectuals who confuse cheap atheism and the defiling of other men's altars with deep thinking, moral and spiritual hooligans and yahoos, who resent all forms of order as an encroachment upon their diminutiae."

The world, after all, is not made up wholly of the unbelieving, the selfish and the lustful, as many of our slice of life novelists would have us think. Dickens and Thackeray, while they drew to the life many base and repulsive characters, also left us, it must not be forgotten, a multitude of noble and attractive men and women. Those eminent novelists, close students as they were of human nature, would certainly be the last to own, as so many of our modern realists seem to hold, that a slice of life story to be faithful and "artistic" must carefully exclude characters whose attractiveness is chiefly due to their consistent practice and profession of Our Saviour's Divine teachings.

## Literature

### FIVE NOVELS BY AMERICANS

HERE are five novels by Americans, but if they are American novels, God help America! They are at present having a great vogue; but whether they are so widely read because they represent the lives of the people who read them or because the people who read them want to know how they seem to look in print is a question. Mrs. Wharton's "Age of Innocence" (Appleton) is the work of a master in the art of fiction, although she seems to have forsaken real art since she wrote "The Valley of Decision." The scene is laid in that time, which seems old now, when Mr. Ward McAllister was unconsciously laying the foundation for that section of society which was later to be known as the "Smart Set." It was an elemental time, a time when society in New York was scarcely affected by any cosmopolitan influence, when American art was just showing its head, when class distinctions were being carefully drawn, when the descendants of the Dutch *bourgeoisie*, reinforced by the newly rich, were assuming to be aristocrats, when Sarony was a fashionable photographer, and Augustin Daly was beginning to create a new form of dramatic art, when the opera was an exotic, when taste was rudimentary, and religion, as known to society, was something set apart for decorous Sundays; but it was not an "age of innocence," for Madame Restell was the high priestess of a cult which today has another name; which caused *Puck* or some other satirical paper of the time, to represent Fifth Avenue as a desert of childlessness; when "Jim" Fiske was a distinguished citizen, and Boss Tweed was a ruler in the land.

No; it was not the age of innocence, although in many respects it was the age of ignorance, and a very complacent ignorance. And this ignorance is shown by the absence of spirituality in the lives of Mrs. Wharton's characters. Christianity does not seem to exist for them, that is, that mystical religion which is not merely a convention. Mrs. Wharton's novel is a somewhat dim mirror of a section of the time, only of a section. But why, in a representation of American society as it was, and in a measure as it is, is there no note of cheerfulness, no note of gaiety, none of that humor with which even the vagaries

of "Jim" Fiske and the eminent New Yorkers of the time was tinged? Was American life then so drab? Those who remember that epoch recall that there was much of consolation, a certain amount of cheerfulness and a great deal of spirituality, not confined to any set in society. It seems the business of the American novelist writing today to assume that man lives by bread alone, and that after he has eaten his bread, with all the jam he can get, there is nothing left for him.

"Miss Lulu Bett" (Appleton by Zona Gale, is better written than any late novel produced by an American, and it is less self-conscious. She has caught the impersonal technique of the best modern French stylists; but, if it is a picture of American life as lived by Americans, it would seem that what we need is not more "Americanization," but the addition of some foreign blood which will add joy, beauty and that quality of contrast which the most helpless and the most homeless of the un-Americanized must feel when he stands under the glowing window of the Cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris, before the "Descent from the Cross" in Antwerp, or in the majesty of the great Dom of Cologne. This is a clever novel, an interesting novel, a novel which has in it all the materials of a good play; it is not hopeless, but it is without real gaiety or that sense of contrast of the commonplaces of life with higher things which makes the ordinary man see at times glimpses of that light which never was on sea or land. Either Miss Gale had no eye for the greater things of life, or they do not exist in her world.

"Main Street" (Harcourt & Brace) by Sinclair Lewis, is a real addition to the literature of fiction, because it is the personal record of the impressions of a quick, receptive and observant mind of a small Western town; but it is with the impressions of the author, rather than with the characters he attempts to photograph, that we most concern ourselves. The picture is doubtless true; and so far as it is true, it is hopeless. There is no question that Carol Milford is a well-balanced sketch from life, and that she is typical. She is the result of a system of education which leaves out of life the dogmas and the discipline of Christianity. She has neither fixed principles of morals nor of taste. Her morals seem to have been formed by instinct or



by such conventional surroundings and traditions as she did not rebel against. She longs for the beautiful as depicted in books; she has never seen anything really beautiful, except what nature, in a prairie town, has shown her. The community in which she lives seems to have no need for beauty. There are mysteries going on in the little Catholic Church which are alien. They might, perhaps, give her a key to a wondrous world, of which her de-civilized education has taught her nothing.

She has been led to believe that clean streets and civic forums and "community days" and the reproductions of pictures and statues by the great masters, and excerpts from the new poets and the theatrical performances of Shaw and perhaps of Strindberg are essential to the development of the soul, and she relies on these alone. She wilfully refuses to have a child, though instinctively she would like to have one or two, perhaps. This is the way of the world in which she lives, and nobody condemns it. The element in Gopher Prairie, whose main street gives the name to the novel, which accepts the teachings of Christ and which seems uncouth in the eyes of the smug citizens of the town, is a negligible quantity, for even in Gopher Prairie there is an aristocracy.

The most vivid and really dramatic of these five novels is Mrs. Gertrude Atherton's "The Sisters-in-Law" (Stokes) and here the aroma of California aristocracy is almost suffocating; but that is another question. Mrs. Atherton evidently knows her world, and it is a very sad world. It is without cheerfulness or gaiety or the joy of life. The principal character, like Carol Milford, has outgrown Christianity. It never occurs to her that in throwing over a stupid husband because he is stupid and annexing a less stupid man, she is debasing the moral currency. The Sixth Commandment does not exist for her. Mrs. Atherton makes no excuses, but simply gives the facts of the case. This heroine has been taught to look on marriage as a contract that may be broken by the party of the second part at will, without regard to the position of the party of the first part. She, too, as is the habit of the characters in the novels that describe American life, has refused to have children. At the end, we are left with the sweet hope that, as her economic condition has improved, she may change her mind, but that question will be one that she will answer according to her caprice. Women of her type have come to regard the Scarlet Letter as a conventional symbol which simply means emancipation; and yet no critic has so far attempted to deny that Mrs. Atherton portrays a phase of our life truthfully.

"Moon-Calf" (Knopf) by Floyd Dell is, too, the work of an observer, and an observer who has learned how to write; but, with all its eloquence and fluency, it was not worth writing, that is if the art of fiction is at its best a fair showing of the good and bad in life, or a means of giving us something better and more beautiful than we think of every day or we find ordinarily in common life. The hero is a young man of sensibility, in the Rousseau sense, utterly selfish, incapable of any great passion, or even of a knowledge of what romance means; and he adds to his defects that of being a very mediocre poet. He does not believe in God because he has never been taught to believe in Him. "Moon-Calf" is the most useless of all these novels. It has only this value: It shows that those forces in our life which we are trying to Americanize are already "Americanized," but not Christianized. And Americanization without Christianity can never come to any good. Both Washington and Lincoln have taught us this.

MAURICE FRANCIS EGAN.

#### IN PETTO

(After Communion)

I own nor lands nor gold,  
Nor any share of might,  
But in my breast I hold  
The World's Delight.

I walk the crowded street  
Innominate, alone,  
But round me Angels greet  
God on His Throne.

Without are strife and care,  
The city's stir and din,  
But I Love's Secret bear  
Within, within.

BLANCHE M. KELLY.

#### REVIEWS

**A Gildsman's Interpretation of History.** By ARTHUR J. PENTY. New York: Sunrise Turn Inc.

This is one of many books written by non-Catholics at the present day in strong defense of the medieval civilization, as superior, in many respects and in the noblest sense, to that of our own times. He refuses to accept the long-standing prejudice against things medieval as a mere misunderstanding, but proclaims it to have been due entirely to a wilful conspiracy against the truth. Cobbett, he shrewdly says, went to the bottom of it all when a hundred years ago he pointed out that: "Protestant historians had wilfully misrepresented the Middle Ages because there were so many people living on the plunder of the monasteries and the gilds, and consequently interested in maintaining a prejudice against the Middle Ages." Cobbett's "History of the Reformation" was burned by the public hangman because it exposed a conspiracy. Protestantism itself he looks upon, historically, as merely camouflaged capitalism, just as Luther gained his power by supplying a version of Christianity acceptable to the princes of his day.

But the great frontal attack of the book is against Roman law in which he sees the reason for the entire catastrophe of civilization, and the decline of liberty and democracy in our modern times as compared with the Middle Ages. He sees Roman law as a dark specter constantly seeking to gain control anew of the civilized world and to replace the medieval Christian law, until it finally accomplished this in the modern Protestant system. Yet Roman law, in its origin, he regards as merely intended to support the decaying capitalism of ancient Rome.

It is with a mingled feeling of satisfaction and regret that a Catholic reads this volume. In numberless pages it bears a splendid witness to the greatness of the Middle Ages and shows how far our modern system has deteriorated economically, politically, artistically, and in many other ways, from the beauty and truth of the Catholic ideal. At the same time there are misunderstandings on the author's part of things Catholic and of Church history on which a Catholic friend might have set him right. In fact he lacks completely all understanding of the Catholic Church today. We are very far, indeed, from agreeing with all that he says with so much assurance, yet the book will help to clear away countless prejudices and so at least help in spreading the truth.

J. H.

**A Century of Persecution Under Tudor and Stuart Sovereigns.** From Contemporary Records. By the Rev. St. GEORGE KIERAN HYLAND, D.D., Ph.D. New York: E. P. Dutton Co. \$8.00.

It is a fascinating task, while locked in some old muniment room to pore over ancient manuscripts, cartularies and yellow-stained letters. But it is a difficult task to collate them and to methodize them into a consistent whole. Dr. Hyland evidently performed a work of love when he pondered over the rich store of old documents numbering over 2,000 papers and parchments, now preserved at Losely Hall, Surrey. While these documents were in the Public Record Office, he studied them carefully, then made a selection of such as were suited to his purpose, that of calling attention to the sufferings and heroism of English Catholics under the Tudors and the Stuarts. Catholics and all lovers of historical truth will be grateful to the author for the sincerity,

zeal and untiring labor shown in his self-imposed task. The results of his manuscript-hunting are evident in the light they throw on many an incident of the tragedy in which English Catholics were the victims in those stormy years, which saw the English people robbed of their Faith and an alien creed fastened upon them by threat, trickery and fraud. The book therefore is an answer to Dr. Hyland's own question: "How is it that a religion which had been the religion of Englishmen for over six-hundred years, honored, loved, and as Newman says, energizing in a thousand channels, was in the space of a few years almost entirely swept away?" Such chapters in the volume as "Bruised Reeds" "In the Wine Press," "The Roll of Honor," "The Last Decade of Elizabeth," will afford a partial clew at least to the solution.

There is in the work of Dr. Hyland much that is instructive and interesting. The book would have gained, however, both in instructive value as well as in interest, had the necessarily disconnected materials of the Losely documents been more tightly bound together and made to bear more forcibly on his main theme. But the author's intention, in the introduction of episodic matter, was not only to give us the substance of the valuable Losely records, but to paint a picture of the England of the Tudors and the Stuarts and thus give us the historical background of the Age of the English Persecutions. In that light, the prologue which describes in a rather imaginative way English life in pre-Reformation days, thus recalling Cardinal Gasquet's "Henry VIII and the English Monasteries," and the chapter devoted to the Overbury Plot, in which James I played such an un-Christian and unkingly part, may be partially excused although the matter is but remotely connected with the main theme. In the matter of dates, signatures of well-known men and Latin transcriptions, several mistakes, which could easily be avoided, have crept into the text. In the Appendix, on page 385 and 386, there is a list of names, or rather of strange hieroglyphics, which to the ordinary reader must be simply unintelligible. The author, we think, should have made some effort to elucidate or amend it. The book bears the imprimatur of Canon Surmont, Vicar General of Westminster.

J. C. R.

**Right Royal.** By JOHN MASEFIELD. New York: The Macmillan Co. \$1.75.

In times when it is the literary fashion to take deep dives into the inner consciousness to see how far one can get away from realities, it is a great relief to turn to John Masefield. He has a healthy interest in objectivities. The burden of life and experience has not extinguished his youthful eagerness and enjoyment among the many spectacles the universe affords. And, best of all, he does not take himself too seriously as a prophet simply because he happens to be a poet.

A year ago he gave us "Reynard the Fox," said to be "the greatest hunting poem ever written"; now he comes forward with a spirited metrical narrative of a steeplechase. As far as the narrative goes, we have again all the familiar properties of the good old race-course story as told in ancient ballad and modern movie. Mr. Masefield knows quite well that he has to whet an appetite grown feeble from indulgence. He begins accordingly with pentameters well spread with alluring poetry, in which he introduces a very lovable hero and heroine and discloses a very distressing situation indeed. Having made sure of the fastidious reader, the poet throws the rein to his muse and gallops off in a ballad measure of anapestic speed; and if the most fastidious reader is not carried far beyond his usual hour for going to bed he must be beyond the capacity for excitement. Students of the short-story will find it instructive to note how Mr. Masefield lends a certain noble dignity to the elements of a plot which has always seemed to be inseparably connected with cheap and rather vulgar melodrama. The poet has not only written a narrative poem of consequence; he has redeemed

the racing story from its worst features of low greed and the smell of the gamester.

J. J. D.

**Missale Romanum ex Decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini Restitutum, A Pio V Pontificis Maximi Jussu Editum. Aliorum Pontificum Cura Recognitum, a Pio X Reformatum, et Ssmi D.N. BENEDICTI XV Auctoritate Vulgatum. Editio Juxta Typicum Vaticanum.**

**Missale Romanum, etc.** New York: Benziger Brothers.

Synopsis Additionum et Variationum in Editione Typica Missalis Romani Factarum. Proposita a FRANCISCO BREHM, Sacerdote. New York: Frederick Pustet & Co.

The long expected new Missal has at last come. Frederick Pustet and Benziger Brothers already have theirs on the market and Kennedy's will soon be out. Father Brehm has also prepared a timely synopsis of the new Missal which will give clerical purchasers a clear idea of its contents. In the first part of his little book will be found the additions and variations with brief notes and in the second are the rules taken from the rubrics of the Missal. This section is divided into twenty headings: The division of the Roman Missal, the distinction of the Masses, the conventual Mass, the parochial Mass, private Masses, votive Masses in general, solemn votive Masses, privileged votive Masses, private votive Masses, Masses for the dead, Masses in a strange church, Masses in private oratories, privilege for priests with failing eyesight, the Alleluja, etc., the prayers in general and special and common commemorations, the Sequences, Prefaces, etc. In the third part will be found a list of the changes made in the typical edition. There is a good index.

The Benziger Missal, which is at the reviewer's elbow, is attractively bound in red leather, is printed on light paper and has just before the Canon a fine engraving of the Crucifixion. The copy that the Pustet Company sent for notice is larger, heavier and more sumptuous, the pictures being in brilliant colors and the binding in black. The publishers of the "Pustet edition" have especially consulted the convenience of the celebrant by inserting pages containing all the *orationes communes* for Lent, Advent, and other prayers assigned for different seasons of the year, the Epistles, Gospels and commemorations being all put *in extenso* in their proper places.

W. B.

## BOOKS AND AUTHORS

**The Japanese Question.**—In "Seed of the Sun" (Doran, \$2.00) Mr. Wallace Irwin has written a good story with California as its setting. His character portrayal is clever and there is action in every page. And there is more than a story in "Seed of the Sun." Stripped of its novel form, the book presents the case for Japanese exclusion. For the author's thesis is that there is operating in California a persistent well-directed policy of conquest dictated by skilled agents of high rank responsible to the Government of the Mikado. This arresting and alarming thesis is proved to the satisfaction of the average novel-reader by the usual methods of propagandist fiction. The Japanese have shown their ability to conquer land in California, for they can do far more with an acre than the whites can, for they work from sunrise to sunset and are joined in their farm-work by their wives and children. According to Mr. Irwin the white man's methods and ultimately the white man's blood are to make of the yellow race masters of the earth. But the Japanese constitute, it must be remembered, just two per cent of California's rapidly growing population, and they occupy only one and one-sixth per cent of California's farmlands. All the Japanese children born in that State in a decade do not equal the number of whites born there in a year.

**The Rigors of Italy.**—Miss Tony Cyriax is an English woman who went to Italy to live there for a while the life of poverty and hardship led by the people in a mountain village of the



North, and she has put into a book written and illustrated with artistic simplicity an account of her sojourn "Among Italian Peasants" (Dutton). Rosina, her hostess; the lazy Riccado, Nino, who was fined for holding a Sunday dance at his inn, and a dozen or two more natives, including an unworthy priest, are vividly described, their conversations repeated and the rigors of their daily life forcibly pictured. Oftentimes all that keeps many of these poor villagers from starvation is the money earned in the United States by some of their reluctantly absent relatives. The author might have spared us the peasants' oaths and blasphemies.—Dr. Herbert Adams Gibbons has brought out an interesting book of travel called "Riviera Towns" (McBride, \$6.00). Towns and hamlets, medieval and modern, are made to live in his pages. The winter playground of Europe is described in all its own beauty, not the beauty that the holiday-seeker brings to it, but the beauty that is riveted in its countryside and its ancient buildings. There are thirty-two full-page illustrations by Lester George Hornby that add artistic interest to a very well-written travel diary.

**The Airman's Death.**—There is real poetry in Amory Hare's "Tossed Coins" (Lane, \$1.50). Witness these lines "To My Cousin":

You who seemed winged even when a lad,  
With that swift look of those who know the sky,  
It was no blundering Fate who stooped and bade  
You break your wings and fall to death and die.  
I think one day you may have flown too high,  
So that Immortals saw you and were glad,  
Watching the beauty of your spirit's flame,  
Until they loved and called you . . . and you came.

**Fiction.**—In "She and Allan" (Longmans, \$2.25), Sir H. Rider Haggard's latest novel, the fair and uncanny Ayesha, to whom we were first introduced some thirty years ago, again comes on the scene and so does Umslopogaas, the doughty axeman, while it is Allan Quartermain, of course, who tells everything that happened. There are several big fights and hunting adventures that are well described and the story will hold the reader's interest, but "She-who-must-be-obeyed," alas! seems to have lost much of her fascination.—In "The Cross of Pearls" (Macmillan) Mrs. Catherine Bearne has written an excellent story about a French Catholic family of the fourteenth century which will delight boys and girls in their early teens. The manner of life followed in a knight's castle during the era of the Hundred Years' War and the Jacquerie is well described and the story's action centers round the fair lass Blanche and the brave lad Raoul, a Catholic atmosphere pervades the tale and Father Roche is a very worthy clerk.—The first half of "Ellen Levis" (Houghton Mifflin, \$2.00), Elsie Singmaster's new story about the Pennsylvania Dutch, will interest the reader, for she vividly describes the Seventh Day Adventists' manner of life and tells how little Ellen revolted from their creed and determined to be a doctor and of all the difficulties she met with. But the latter part of the story follows the formula for machine-made novels.

## EDUCATION

### Governor Miller Speaks His Mind

**"IMPERIAL** at last is the voice of the Empire State." *Harvey's Weekly* for January 15 made use of this enthusiastic phrase to characterize the first legislative message of Governor Miller, of New York. Not every reader will share Colonel Harvey's enthusiasm, or allow, with him, that the Empire State was voiceless until the new year, and particularly not those readers who count themselves among the admirers of Governor Miller's gallant predecessor. Still, all will admit that the new Governor has spoken his mind upon the needs of the

commonwealth with admirable vigor and business sense. In the recommendations of the message bearing upon education, the Catholic educator finds strong support in his lonely defense of the traditional American ideals. Like himself, Governor Miller is no believer in an educational bureaucracy, and theorists of the Smith-Towner species, who would hand over to a department of education the responsibility of curing a nation's ills, will find little to comfort them in the New York executive's message.

Governor Miller's main thesis is the immediate need of financial retrenchment in the State administration, and it is *via* this route that he comes to speak of education. With the budget of the State Department of Education before him, he selects a few specific items for consideration. More than \$5,000,000, he points out, were spent last year on salaries, traveling expenses, etc., for carrying out the physical-training program of the Department, and another quarter-million for "Americanization" work. For military training in the schools, \$323,000 was appropriated. The Governor is of the opinion that the latter can be absolutely eliminated, and the other two phases of work either eliminated or greatly reduced. His reasons are set forth without gloss:

I do not minimize the importance of Americanization or physical training, and in dealing with such subjects, I would not err on the side of economy. But our necessities require us to be practical about these matters, and I doubt that much of the work so far done has been practical. *I believe that we have started with too large an overburden at the wrong end.* Such work can only be done with effectiveness locally, and then only in harmony with local circumstances and conditions. It cannot be forced upon people, and I believe that there has been too much centralization of administration in the State which has added to the burden of both state and local government. The elementary schools do not have the facilities such as exist in the secondary schools, and such work in incompetent hands produces more harm than good. (*Italics inserted.*)

Several sentences of the above paragraph suggest comparison and reflection. Under the influence of the propaganda for war preparedness from 1916 to 1918, New York passed a number of thorough-going laws providing for compulsory physical and military training and Americanization work in the schools. A force of inspectors and supervisors was added to the staff of the Department of Education to see that these provisions were carried out, and a 300-page syllabus of physical training was placed in the hands of every teacher. Private schools as well as public schools came under the act, and every school child in the State over eight years of age was to receive six hours a week of physical training. The measures for Americanization were of a similarly drastic and compulsory nature, and they, too, were entrusted to a salaried staff of inspectors and supervisors.

### EDUCATIONAL FALLACIES

**THIS** entire group of laws illustrates the centralization fallacy that has afflicted the nation's educators during the past dozen years, and more especially since the first years of the World War. Is it discovered that ten per cent of the foreign-born population cannot read English? Get the State legislature to appropriate \$100,000 for a new bureau of Americanization, and pass a law commanding all foreign-born illiterates to present themselves five nights a week for language-instruction. Is it proved that five per cent of the children under twelve are below weight? Appropriate enough money from the State treasury to place a weighing-scale in every school, to serve a bottle of milk and six graham crackers to every underweight child at the noon-hour, and a trained school-nurse to be in constant attendance. There is no ill in the social fabric that cannot be cured by the creation of a new bureau of salaried experts and the application of a generous Federal

or State appropriation. It is by a political philosophy such as this, a popular superstition, Dr. Judd, of the University of Chicago, would call it, that democracies are transformed into bureaucracies. "The popular mind," said Dr. Judd before the American Council on Education last May, "seems prone to accept the assumption that the Government can with propriety undertake everything and anything. The most insidious form of this popular superstition is the widespread belief that the Government has unlimited financial resources upon which it is entirely legitimate to draw for any worthy enterprise which is otherwise likely to become insolvent." Dr. Judd was speaking of the Federal Government, and with particular reference to the Smith-Towner bill, but his words are no less applicable to conditions within the several States.

A number of signs point to the ebbing of the tide that was flowing so strongly towards excessive centralization during the war, and one of these is Governor Miller's message. The elaborate machinery set up by the New York legislature during the war period, whereby the children of the State were to be made thoroughly "fit" and thoroughly American, does not seem to have worked the miracles expected from it. "I doubt," says Governor Miller, "that much of the work so far done has been practical." Of the military training commission he writes, "I think that all agree that, up to date, its work has not warranted its cost. . . . Here, again, I think, we must rely for the practical results, which the commission hopes to secure, upon voluntary work through organizations like the Boy Scouts." Here the Governor touches upon a truth that bureaucrats find decidedly unpalatable, viz., that there are many tasks in education, as in other departments of man's life, which must be left to local initiative to undertake, and which cannot be successfully accomplished by a staff of outsiders, however expert and however large their salaries.

#### TOO MUCH BUREAUCRACY

THE essential work of the school system of a State is a matter, in Governor Miller's opinion, that does not require a complicated system of State inspection. To quote again from his message:

By all means, let the elementary teachers be trained to look after the health and physical well-being of their pupils. And let the Department of Education continue in a practical way to advance the cause of education, both mental and physical. [But] the first duty of the State is to provide an elementary education for all our boys and girls, and nothing should be permitted to interfere with the full discharge of that duty. A proper elementary education given the children of the foreign-born will do more than any one other thing to advance the work of Americanization, and I have a very strong feeling that compulsory physical training should not be allowed to interfere with the essential work of elementary schools, and that Americanization work outside the schools can best be done through voluntary local effort and industries whose selfish interest properly aroused should stimulate such work.

Sensible words, these, and thoroughly in accord with traditional American ideals. It is time to resume the powers of local action that during the war period were handed over, for common good, to the State and Federal governments. The American ideal is a democracy, not a bureaucracy, and *E pluribus unum*, whatever else it may connote, is meant to suggest a national unity rather than a national uniformity. Russia under the Czars, Prussia under the Kaisers, had uniformity certainly, but it is very doubtful whether they had any real national unity. Under the pressure of economic stress our political executives are beginning to see this. Examining the workings of bureaucracy, they first of all find that it is inefficient and wasteful. The discovery spurs them on to the further discovery that it is wrong in principle. They come to see, with Governor Miller, that in much of our educational efforts

"we have started with too large an overburden at the wrong end," that the fruits of education, however good in themselves, "cannot be forced upon people," and finally, that a great deal of educational work "can only be done with effectiveness locally and then only in harmony with local circumstances and conditions." The healthy reaction from wartime centralization is with us, and may more executives like Governor Miller speak their mind!

LEIGH G. HUBBELL, C.S.C.

## SOCIOLOGY

### An Economic Development in France

AFTER his *voyage d'études* of several months during 1919 in the United States Professor Charles Cestre of the University of Bordeaux, France, thought the economic outlook of the country encouraging. Indeed, the increasing number, now over 300, of managing-sharing plans and the growing prestige of the profit-sharing system seem almost to justify the impression. But the French professor would today say the same for his own country. The social and economic movement at present sweeping France gives radiant promise while the rapidity of its progress is phenomenal. The movement is towards a common compensation-fund for the worker from which is drawn over and above his ordinary wage a regular monthly dividend greater or less according to the number of children in his family. The crying need for a real family-wage in France is what explains more than anything else the progressive speed of this arrangement in favor of the worker, while on the moral side the movement is being influenced in no small degree by Catholic thought and principle.

#### RESULTS OF BIRTH-CONTROL

BEFORE the war the decline of the French birth-rate was well known. The alarming practice of birth-control in France has been considered by many in the United States as existing only or chiefly among the upper classes, but such is not the case. The evil, if begun in the higher circles, long ago seeped down to the working-classes. Statistics taken since the war tell the tale but too clearly. In September, 1919, a group of factory-owners with a view to joining the new movement gathered information as to the marriage and birth-rate among 99,650 of their employees in and about Paris. The result was published in the *Revue d'Economie Politique* for November, 1920. It showed that 36.9% of the workers were unmarried, or widowers or divorced without children; 63.1% were living in a family or were heads of families. Of these families 38.4% had no children; 33.6% had 1 child; 17.5% had 2 children; 6.4% had 3 children; 2.5% had 4 children; and 1.6% had 5 or more children. So that 89.5% of the families had no children or but one or two, making approximately an average of one child a family. When we remember that 36.9% of the workers were living outside of all family ties, this figure becomes discouraging in the extreme. Other districts present a similar proportion. At Elbeuf in Normandy out of 9,500 workers but 2,025 were married and the children numbered only 3,613; 1.66% per family. At Unieux in the Department of the Loire, of 606 families 105 had no children, 225 had 1 child, 140 had 2 children, and 136 had 3 or more. In other words 78% had no children, or but one or two; 22% had more than two. It would be tedious to give more; the other figures are not more reassuring.

The causes for this sad state of affairs are not far to seek. The lack of religious instruction in the schools from the time of the Great Revolution and the Code Napoleon to the year 1850, when at last the Catholics won the privilege of exercising their right of maintaining free schools; the continued lack of such teaching in the schools of the State up to the present time; the shameless propaganda against all morality and against the family



carried on by the Socialist and anticlerical forces after the political defeat of the conservative Catholic party in 1880, all these causes have brought about the spread of the practice of birth-control among all classes in France, with the fatal results which the figures just quoted have shown. But for the workers, the additional inducement, as they aver, to such practice is "economic necessity." It was difficult enough, said the worker, to support a family with pre-war wages; since the war it has become an impossibility. Hence, celibacy, or birth-control in an appalling degree. Considering the 600,000 workers lost in the war in a country totaling less than 40,000,000, with a shortage of labor bound to occur as soon as French industry becomes fully reinstated, it is no wonder that the employer has at last awakened to the alarming economic and social need of his country, and is taking measures for the repression of an abuse that threatens soon to close up his factory for want of active hands to labor. The compensation-fund (*caisse de compensation*) for growing families is the means now being adopted throughout the nation.

#### COMPENSATION FUND

OF course, the movement in France for larger families is quite general. This was brought out in these columns in the issue of December 27, 1919, under the title: "That France May Live." There is *La Ligue des Familles Nombreuses et de la Répopulation*, and the society of *La Plus Grande Famille*. But the movement spoken of here is in favor of the worker; it is as much economic as social and harbingers a salutary *rapprochement* between capital and labor. The bare idea of dividends for a worker with children is not new. Dividends in favor of the increasing families of employees and premiums for the birth of every child have been in vogue for some years by the Government and by individual firms. But the new movement makes for great combinations of different firms into a unified syndicate for the establishment of a great and stable common fund. They remain distinct in all else, but they unite to form the compensation fund, and this union is necessary if the fund is to be secure and the system of compensation general and enduring. The arrangement briefly is this. The different firms group together according to districts, or according to interrelation of industries, and agree to pay at certain fixed periods a specified amount into a common compensation fund. From this fund is drawn a varying amount of capital to be paid regularly to the heads of families, over and above the ordinary wage, according to the number of children in the family. The system will be better understood by citing a working example. The textile industries of Normandy comprising 140 houses united on June 27, 1919, to form a *caisse de compensation*. This common fund is administered by an executive board of president, secretary, treasurer, etc. Each of these 140 houses pays yearly into the fund two per cent of its wage-expenses. Thus over 2,000,000 francs go every year into the fund from which is taken monthly the fees for those families of the employees of the 140 houses that have children under thirteen years of age. For families of one child 15 francs a month; for two children, 35 francs a month; for three 60 francs; for four 90 francs, etc. There is besides a premium of 150 francs for every birth in the family of an employee. The syndicate of the industrial group in the Paris district pays four per cent of its wage expenses into the common fund, and an inquiry instituted in June, 1920, showed that this wage expense was 1,500,000,000 francs for the year, so that approximately 60,000,000 francs went into the compensation fund. Thus it is that already this new development has begun to play an important role in the social and economic life of the nation.

The spread of the movement, as hinted at above, has been most extraordinary. The first *caisse de compensation* was begun at Grenoble in 1918 by the eminent Catholic economist E.

Romanet. Four other similar funds were begun by syndicates in the course of 1919. So great was their success and so promising a solution did they offer for pressing economic difficulties, that twenty had already been formed by July, 1920, of which nine united cognate industries, and eleven united all industries in the same region or territory. At the end of 1920 there were already forty and by the time these paragraphs go to press the number may be close to fifty.

Here it would seem is at last a practical solution of the difficulty of the family-wage. Discarding the old system which clung coldly and hardly to the principle that the wage be proportioned to the labor, and adopting the more humanitarian method that the wage be proportioned to the labor plus the needs of the worker, the promoters of the compensation fund seem to solve the real difficulty. For, in justice, if the needs of the worker will increase according to the size of his family, then too his wage, supposedly a family-wage, should also increase. The compensation-fund by its premium for births and its monthly dividend for each child of a family offers this increase in wage in proportion to the needs of the worker.

#### APPLICATION OF CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES

WE have besides in this whole movement a shining example of the beneficent influence, upon modern problems of Catholic thought and principles. Pope Leo XIII in his famous Encyclical long ago sounded the note of Christian humanity by his advocacy of a sufficient wage for the worker. "It is a dictate of nature more imperious and more ancient than any bargain between man and man that the remuneration must be enough to support the wage-earner in reasonable comfort." Thus spoke Pope Leo, and our American Bishops but two years ago took up the cry: "The several States should enact laws providing for the establishment of wage-rates that shall be at least sufficient for the decent maintenance of a family." (American Bishops on Social Reconstruction). Dr. Ryan of the Catholic University championed the same Christian principles when last year he took to task Judge Gary and the methods of the United States Steel Corporation. Colonel Callahan has put these principles into practice in his factories at Louisville, Kentucky, and now in France if this new great economic and social development of the compensation fund for family dividends has become a surprising success, and a light of economic hope for a brighter future, it is due primarily and chiefly to Catholic thought and Catholic action. He who gave a beginning to, and offered the first working example of, this system at Grenoble in 1918 is the eminent Catholic economist, E. Romanet. The Catholic Minister of Commerce of France, M. Isaac, also president of the society *La Plus Grande Famille* is an enthusiastic supporter and promoter. In October, 1918, he presented to the society two different reports strongly recommending the measure. The official organ of *La Plus Grande Famille* with its Catholic secretary, M. Veuillot, is heart and soul for the movement, as is General de Castelnau, president of *La Ligue des Familles Nombreuses et de la Répopulation*. But there is still a more consoling feature: the larger number of the great captains of industry in France today are Catholics and consequently open to the influence of Catholic principles which are continually agitated by the well-known group of Jesuit social workers of the *Action Populaire* with headquarters at Paris. The *Action Populaire* is not only enthusiastically promoting the compensation fund, but is exercising a religious and a Christian influence in the determination of many of its details.

France has sometimes been spoken of in the United States as weak in its Catholicism, but it is no small affair to have a majority of the great leaders of industry thus open to the humanitarian influences of Catholicism. Though the rapid movement of the *caisse de compensation* has undoubtedly been due to social and economic necessity, still the possibilities for the

introduction of the proper working principles of morality and justice are great, and the details are many and various in which these influences are actually finding concrete and substantial expression. Thus the Catholic leaven in the social and economic life of France is already working, with infinite possibilities for the future for the wholesomeness and lightness of the mass. The old and true Catholic energies have again begun to stir to the immense advantage of the whole country. It is clearly seen now, and acknowledged, too, by the more honest opponent, who were the real patriots in the days of conflict before the war, and who stood for a healthy and a progressive France. It was not the anticlerical and radical with his fatal practice and poisonous propaganda of immorality, but the Catholic with his age-old principles of correct living drawn from the bosom of the Catholic Church. And so the Church again stands forth, as so many outside her fold have noted, as a bulwark against the rush of Bolshevik radicalism and is the sustaining rock of society in a surrounding welter of dissolution and ruin.

PETER M. DUNNE, S.J.

### NOTE AND COMMENT

#### The Smoke Screen of Bigotry

ACCORDING to the *Denver Catholic Register* the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass is once again under fire from the Prohibitionists. In California they have published misleading statistics, without adequate explanation, to convey the impression that there is an excessive use of wine in the Church. The *Register* declares:

There are some sectarians in this country who consider it the work of the devil to use anything but imitation grape juice in their so-called communion services. And as they cannot convert the world to their way of thinking by preaching, they have decided to do it, if possible, by force of police power. They were not satisfied when they secured prohibition legislation that stopped the saloon and wholesale liquor establishment evil, but continued working, step by step, until they gave us bone-dry fiction and bootleg reality. Now, instead of trying to find a way to stop the sale of bootleg while preventing a recurrence of the saloon evil, they are going to give their attention to the Catholic Mass, and outlaw it if possible. Their whole aim in the prohibition movement was not to bring reform, but to strike at the Mass. So they get together some figures with which they try to make it look as if Catholics and Lutherans and Greek Orthodox are using more wine than is needed for sacramental purposes.

The Lutheran and Greek Orthodox churches, insignificant in California, are mentioned merely that the attack may not seem to be launched against Catholics exclusively. The amount of wine is counted by gallons and not by barrels, to make it appear the larger, and no hint is given for how many clergymen it was bought. "Protestants, being used to have only one clergyman at a church and about one so-called communion service a month, are shocked at the figures. But no attention is called to the fact that there are a half dozen Masses said daily in the Cathedral parish, and many more at our hospitals." Similar misleading figures, we are told, are to be published in every State of the Union. The smoke screen is slowly lifting as the attack must be carried on more in the open, but the same hypocritical tactics will still be followed with the same purpose in view.

#### Anti-Catholic Bills

HOW prevalent the spirit of intolerance is becoming in the United States is again made apparent by a bill recently introduced into the General Assembly at Columbus, Ohio, by Richard R. Hawkins. The bill, says the Cincinnati *Enquirer*, is "strongly reminiscent of the old American Protective Asso-

ciation (A. P. A.) days, when organized attempts were made to invade convents and similar institutions." The Hawkins bill is said to be only part of a general movement along these lines. It is needless to give the details of this proposed measure, since we are all sufficiently familiar with the methods followed in the campaign for the destruction of Catholic religious institutions, which is always the preliminary skirmish for an attack upon the Church. It is comforting to note in this connection that Senator Humes's anti-Catholic bill, denying recognition to graduates of private, denominational and parochial schools, was defeated in the Oregon upper house by indefinite postponement, while his second bill, forbidding the wearing in public schools of any garb indicating adherence to any Religious Order, met with adverse sentiment on a roll call.

#### Official Report on Unemployment

ACCORDING to the report of a nation-wide survey of unemployment made by the Department of Labor of the United States there were 3,473,446 less workers employed in the industries of this country at the beginning of the present year than in January of the preceding year. This estimate, it is to be noted, applies to "industry" only. Michigan reports the largest out-of-work army, with a reduction of eighty-two per cent in employment over last year. Ohio and Indiana follow next with fifty per cent reduction, and Illinois with forty-four per cent. New York is short by twenty-eight per cent. The largest number of unemployed is in the automobile industry, which reports sixty-nine per cent unemployed over a year ago. What this implies may be judged from the fact that this industry engages about eight per cent of the total number of workers in all industries. Second in the rank of unemployment is the building trade, with about fifty-two per cent reduction. This report is the reason organized labor offers for urging Congress to prohibit immigration for two years.

#### Jews, Protestants, Catholics, and the Y. M. C. A.

REFERRING editorially to the timely warning of the Holy Office against the Y.M.C.A., the *American Israelite* quotes the following passage from the *Methodist Western Christian Advocate*:

Protestants in this country were not surprised by this pronouncement, because they knew the situation and the attitude that the Roman Catholic leaders had taken in this country. They are not uninformed on the activities of the hierarchy to contest to the last the claim that this is a Protestant country. They are reforming their line toward Protestantism. It can not be struck at any point without the immediate evidence of militant life. That the Pope has issued the decree and placed the Young Men's Christian Association where it of a right belongs will do that organization good. For it will be driven to take a distinctively Protestant stand and be made to look in days to come for support from that section of Christianity.

To all this the Jewish editor remarks that to a neutral observer, who is neither Protestant nor Catholic, it would appear that the editor of the *Advocate* is somewhat lacking in a sense of humor. "If the United States is a 'Protestant country,' as the *Advocate* claims, why is it wrong for the Catholics to try by any honorable means to make it a Catholic country, or for that matter, for the Jews to attempt to make it a Jewish commonwealth?" As a matter of fact the only bodies aiming at a union of Church and State in this country or already proclaiming it as an accomplished fact are certain Protestant sects. They are even now openly imposing their religious tenets and prejudices by political means.